

Appendix

The Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing us at this time is the right to work. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat of September 13, 1961, contained an excellent editorial on the subject and I wish to take this opportunity to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE RIGHT TO WORK

If there is a basic right in the democratic system, it is that every capable citizen should have the same chance to work as any other, regardless of color or creed. This certainly is not true in a tremendous number of cases for the Negro job hunter.

Because many unions, especially craft unions, refuse to accept Negro apprentices in training programs, the Negro is barred from much skilled and semiskilled work.

He is denied opportunity and the higher pay that other citizens may enjoy—simply because his skin is taboo.

This is rank discrimination, a shameless policy of racism, an unquestionable roadblock to dynamic industry in a period when automation is throwing many unskilled laborers out of jobs and opening new fields for skilled workers. Not, however, for the Negro.

In St. Louis, which has an unemployment rate of 8.4 percent, Negro unemployment is 20 percent.

Obviously this is not all due to the unions' bar against Negroes; some of these jobless are drifters, migrants. But some are thoroughly able to do skilled labor—if they could just get the chance.

Recently Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS of St. Louis alluded to this moral and economic evil in a comment on the floor of the House. He referred to a statement by Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which Mr. CURTIS rightly termed "significant." Mr. Hill appeared before the House Committee on Labor and Education last month.

While covering the whole national scene, in discussing union discrimination against Negroes, Secretary Hill said of St. Louis:

"There are no Negro apprentices in the following (union) training programs—electrical, plumbing and steamfitting, carpentry, masonry, cement finishers, lathers and painters.

"There is one Negro apprentice at a non-union Negro-owned sheetmetal company. It is estimated there are 14 Negro apprentices in St. Louis: six bakers, one bricklayer, two machinists, one sheet metal worker and four meatcutters."

Representative CURTIS showed this data to John I. Rollings, president of the Missouri State Labor Council AFL-CIO, and "he stated that this was entirely accurate."

The new report by the Missouri Advisory Committee to the Federal Civil Rights Commission said Carpenters have now let down the bars against Negro membership, as well

as the Bricklayers, Meatcutters and Machinists Unions. However, the Urban League, quoted in the Federal report, declared skilled and semiskilled Negro workers have had to be "content with token gains."

Undoubtedly other areas of employment, where union organization does not obtain, also discriminate, although the Advisory Committee asserted during the last decade Negro job opportunities have improved in the shoe and auto industry, downtown stores, the Public Service Co., McDonnell Aircraft and a few other areas.

The color lid on many craft union memberships remains clamped tight. This policy not only is un-American and hurtful to the general economy—which needs much more skilled labor than is available—but it imposes heavy costs in relief and unemployment compensation, which have to be borne by taxpayers and industry.

Integration cannot be realized overnight in all categories, no matter how just it is, how immoral race cruelty may be. But deliberate rules, banning work opportunity because of a man's color, are one of the most inhumane obstacles to freedom and justice among our own people.

We talk with loud, charged words about self-determination, liberty and the dignity of man, when confronting the Red threat from the Moscow-Peking axis. Shall we continue to ignore our own sins against fundamental freedom?

Address by E. Sherman Adams Before
the Stonier Graduate School of Bank-
ing, at Rutgers University, June 21,
1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address, "The Broadened Responsibilities of Bankers," delivered by E. Sherman Adams, vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, and formerly director of the Stonier Graduate School of Banking, before the student body of the school, at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., June 21, 1961:

THE BROADENED RESPONSIBILITIES OF BANKERS

If an interplanetary commission from outer space were to visit the United States to study American banking, what would its findings be? Would the visitors rank American bankers as being the best all-around bankers in our solar system? Or would they report back to their home planets that we still have a long way to go by cosmic standards?

They would doubtless report certain favorable items. They would find bankers well mannered and well domesticated. And if they were to come here to the graduate school, they would even see some who are

at least in the process of becoming well educated.

But how would they grade American bankers from the standpoint of overall performance? How fully are we living up to our manifold responsibilities in this rapidly changing, highly dangerous atomic age?

THE SETTING HAS CHANGED

You have doubtless pondered this subject from time to time and heard it discussed on various occasions. However, I make no apology for discussing it again because the nature of this problem has changed. History has speeded up. Today's world is vastly different from yesterday's and in this new world, bankers' responsibilities have broadened. Have our thinking and our actions kept pace? We need continually to take a fresh look at this question in the light of new conditions.

In addition, this matter has now assumed far greater urgency. We are all aware that this Nation is engaged in a struggle for survival with a powerful and ruthless enemy. The outcome will depend upon how well democracy performs over the years ahead.

It therefore behooves all citizens to think deeply about their responsibilities to society. And this applies particularly to bankers because there are so many ways in which they can contribute significantly to strengthening the sinews of democracy.

NEW BANKING PROBLEMS

Our day-to-day banking responsibilities are familiar to all of us—serving our customers, extending credit on a sound basis, making our banks good places in which to work, developing capable personnel, and keeping our institutions strong and profitable. These obligations are so obviously important and so immediate that there is little danger that bankers will neglect them.

Yet even here many of the problems confronting us are changing. One basic change is that, after two decades of abnormal liquidity, banks have fast been approaching a fully loaned position. Over the years ahead bank loan-deposit ratios will in all probability remain high and may well go higher than they are today.

This calls for thoroughly rethinking bank management policies. Our primary emphasis must shift from developing loans to developing deposits. Since we cannot plan to expand all types of loans as freely as in the past, we must adapt our lending standards and rationing techniques to this situation and also develop appropriate rationing policies to achieve optimum distribution of our loans. In doing this we must searchingly analyze our responsibilities to provide various types of credit to various categories of borrowers—public and private, individual and corporate, local and non-local, large and small. We may also need to reexamine some of our old rules of thumb with respect to our liquidity and capital positions.

Moreover, the nature of the bank earnings problem is changing before our eyes. For many years we have been sailing along with highly favoring winds—a rising trend of interest rates and rapid load expansion. Now these winds are shifting and bankers will have a more difficult course to steer to maintain good earnings over the years ahead.

Are bankers doing the forward thinking and forward planning needed to protect their future earning capacity? American industry annually spends enormous sums,

billions, for research. Banking does not. The amount of research in banking you could put in your eye. True, banking does not lend itself to research as obviously as many industries do. Nevertheless, the contrast is striking. It makes you wonder.

REVAMPING OUR PRODUCT LINE

One reason for wondering is that banking has been losing ground in competing for financial business. For many years other financial institutions have been growing at a much faster pace than commercial banks. Some bankers blame this on tax inequality, monetary policy, whatnot. But do these answers suffice? One cannot help wondering whether banking has adequately adapted its services to meet the changing needs of the American economy. Does our product line need to be revamped?

To be sure, some new banking services have been introduced in recent years, but more innovations may be needed. We should also critically examine some of our old-line services to see whether they need to be modernized.

Time and savings deposits are an outstanding case in point. In this area most commercial banks have been catering almost exclusively to the small saver. They are not competing effectively for large savings accounts—what might be called investment savings—nor for the excess funds of corporations. Yet these may be the most promising avenues of potential future growth for commercial banks.

This clearly constitutes a major problem and tax equality is by no means a complete solution to it. This is the kind of problem to which bankers should be giving careful, thoughtful study.

IMPORTANCE OF OUR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

However, I am not here to talk shop, tempting though this is. Indeed, most of us are in danger of becoming so engrossed in our shopkeeping problems that we give inadequate attention to our broader public responsibilities.

This would be the worst mistake we could make, even from a strictly self-interest point of view. I say this not merely because what is good for the economy is good for banking, for this is true of most businesses. But the situation of bankers is unique because they are in a position to contribute so significantly to the public welfare—and what is more, the public has some awareness of this fact. The spotlight is always on banking. If bankers fail in their public responsibilities, their failure will be conspicuous.

Also, banking has now become highly dependent upon the goodwill of the public. Banks formerly served only certain classes but now they serve the masses. We find ourselves operating today in a market where the patronage of the public is all important and one in which we face aggressive, formidable competition from other types of financial institutions. In addition, the attitude of the public now has a decisive influence upon legislation and public policies which affect banking.

To a far greater extent than in the past, therefore, banking needs the good regard of the public. This means that bankers must serve the common good to the best of their abilities. And the public will not be fooled on this matter. Over the years the attitude of the public toward banking will depend most upon how well bankers contribute to the general welfare. To be enduring, public esteem must be earned.

But it would do you men an injustice to appeal to you only on grounds of self-interest. None of you is ruled simply by materialistic motives. Each of you has a deep desire to play well your part in the human adventure, to make a success of your relationships with society. A career in banking offers unusual opportunities to do just that—

and indeed, this is doubtless one of the chief reasons why you are attracted to banking.

Moreover, most bankers are imbued with a strong sense of responsibility. Most of us feel that banking partakes of the nature of a public trust. Since he serves all groups in the community, the banker is more aware than many of the interdependence—the mutuality of interest—of the worker, the farmer, the businessman, and the consumer. He appreciates the privilege of being a member of our free American society. He sees how important it is that he should contribute to the common enterprise—not as a matter of noblesse oblige but simply as his plain duty as a member of the society to which he owes so much.

OUR HOMETOWN DUTIES

All this is readily apparent when we look at our local communities. Every banker knows from firsthand experience that the growth and prosperity of his institution are inextricably tied to the growth and prosperity of the area he serves. He knows that he can make important contributions to his community, and that people's appraisal of these contributions will be critical and discerning.

Most bankers are therefore keenly aware of their hometown duties. It is normal to find them in the forefront of civic activities. Bankers bow to no group in the matter of civic spirit.

Yet, here too, the nature of the problems is changing. Many communities are today faced with serious problems of urban blight. The needs for community planning and rehabilitation and for improved community facilities are urgent. They will doubtless continue to constitute a major problem for many years to come.

Some bankers are taking a leading part in urban renewal programs and they shall reap rewards both in heaven and in their operating statements. Others have not yet become involved. Their reluctance is perhaps understandable, but is it wise?

Regional development and resource utilization present similar problems. Here again bankers are in a position to provide constructive leadership and many are doing so. These activities are time consuming, to be sure, but they are clearly important to the long-range welfare of your communities and your institutions.

Another aspect of community relations is the matter of political participation. This is a subject to which you men at the graduate school have been fully exposed so I shall comment on it only briefly, as follows: I know that many of you agree that banks should do more to encourage their people to participate more actively in various types of political activity. Some banks have made important strides in this direction in recent years. This is clearly an area in which there is much more to be done.

ECONOMIC ILLITERACY

Closely related is the matter of economic education. In this democracy of ours, public economic policies are now determined chiefly by Joe Public. Fortunately, Joe has a remarkable endowment of commonsense, and when he is adequately informed about a problem, he usually adopts a sensible attitude toward it. Unfortunately, Joe has little understanding of the economic facts of life. Even among our own bank employees, the rate of economic illiteracy is appallingly high.

This is a dangerous situation and one which should be of concern to bankers. Here again some banks have made some progress in recent years, but most have not. Many bankers still feel that the economic education of the public, or even of their own employees, is not their proper concern.

Does this attitude make sense? Demagogues and pressure groups are busily spread-

ing misinformation and fallacies and taking advantage of the public's ignorance in economic matters. This threatens the future welfare of our entire economy, including the welfare of banking. Bankers who have ignored, or merely deplored, this situation should carefully reconsider whether it is really no concern of theirs.

This does not imply, of course, that bankers should try to assume responsibility for all aspects of economic education. Far from it. To a large extent the banker's role should be one of lending support to the efforts of professional educators. They can also encourage and make it easier for their own staff people to gain a better understanding of economic issues.

THE BANKER-EDUCATOR

Nevertheless, there are some areas in which bankers do possess special competence; namely, banking and finance. The general public and even most bank employees know very little about the banking business and its role in our economy. This is clearly our own fault. We bankers give a great deal of attention to the selling of bank services but very little to the selling of banking as an industry by explaining its functions. And if we do not tell the public the story of banking, no one will do it for us.

Another area with which bankers are particularly concerned is monetary management. Bankers are not always happy about the effects of Federal Reserve policies on the banks but that is beside the point. They know that the Federal Reserve has made and can continue to make an important contribution to the stability of our economy. They therefore have a unique responsibility to contribute to public understanding and support of sound monetary policy.

Take interest rates. Here is a subject of vital concern to bankers and one on which many people harbor dangerous illusions. During recent years the ancient fallacy that cheap money is the cure for our economic ills, has been gaining renewed popularity. Many people, including some in high places, seem to have a notion that it is desirable always to keep interest rates low and that this should be one of the goals of public policy.

This is a threat to banking, clearly, and equally a threat to the public interest. Bankers should have a clear understanding of the role of interest rates in our economy and should do what they can to share that understanding with the public.

This is no easy assignment; indeed, it is one of the toughest. Just try explaining to your wife or to your next-door neighbor why it is important that interest rates should be permitted to rise at times as well as decline at other times. And these, presumably, would be receptive listeners, willing to give you some benefit of the doubt. But the general public is not. It is skeptical, quick to assume you are motivated solely by self-interest. It will listen only if it becomes convinced—against its natural instincts—that bankers really have genuine concern for the common good.

BANKERS AND PUBLIC POLICY

This brings us to another major aspect of a banker's public responsibilities: his role with respect to national economic problems. Clearly bankers should be nation minded as well as community minded. Also, the public image of banking is greatly colored by what bankers do—and fail to do—on the national stage.

I think we should face up to the fact that this image leaves much to be desired. Bankers take pride, and justly so, of the record of public service of members of the banking fraternity such as Joe Dodge, Randy Burgess, and Jack McCloy. This is all to the good but it is not good enough. Many people think of bankers as being generally unen-

lightened and perhaps even antisocial. They have the impression that bankers oppose most progressive measures and are interested chiefly in legislation which will directly benefit the banks. Nor are they too favorably impressed by traditional banker exhortations to balance the budget, reduce taxes, and cut governmental expenditures.

I do not for a moment suggest that bankers should modify their views on public finance simply because they may be unpopular. Indeed, perhaps our first responsibility in national affairs is to work for fiscal sanity. Bankers, more than most groups, understand the importance of sound public finances and this imposes special obligations on them to support sensible monetary and fiscal policies.

On the other hand, even in financial matters, we must beware of being doctrinaire. Lincoln's words of almost a century ago apply today: "The dogmas of the past are inadequate for the stormy present. We must think anew, we must act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves."

NEED FOR A BROAD PERSPECTIVE

Moreover, there are other aspects of public policy with which bankers should be more concerned than they have been. Sound finance is by no means the only ingredient in economic progress nor is it the only one in which bankers should be interested. We should give more attention to other important ingredients—the need for expanding our investment in education, for example. In short, we should strive to develop a broader perspective on national and also international problems.

Take foreign aid. A recent symposium of distinguished scholars and public affairs leaders agreed that foreign aid will be the most important economic problem confronting the United States over the next 20 years. Bankers know full well that as a nation we can and must afford to help strengthen the economies and defenses of other free nations. In the words of former President Eisenhower, "The impoverishment of any single people in the world means danger to the well-being of all other peoples." Bankers should be just as concerned with the adequacy of our foreign aid programs as they are with tax reform.

Similarly, most bankers have a good understanding of other elements of foreign economic policy. They appreciate the importance of a liberal trade policy not only to this country but to the entire free world. They know that the United States cannot exercise moral leadership among nations if we preach one thing and practice another with respect to tariffs, quotas, domestic price supports and the dumping of products in foreign markets. Unless we demonstrate to uncommitted nations that they can trade with us and that it is in their interest to do so, they will trade with Russia and our reluctant grants will do little good.

Bankers have a clear obligation to give their full support to enlightened policies in this area—to such things, specifically, as the reciprocal trade agreements program. Some do speak out on these subjects from time to time, but many are silent, largely because they regard these issues as not really being their concern. Yet this is an area in which bankers could make significant contributions. If they fail to do so, they fail in one of their major responsibilities.

DON'T JUST BE A BANKER—DO SOMETHING

Most of you men, I am sure, are in general sympathy with most of my comments thus far. Nevertheless, you may feel that they do not apply directly to you as an individual at the present time, for two reasons: first, you are up to your ears in bank work for which you are directly responsible. Second, you may feel that these public responsibilities we have been talking about devolve pri-

marily upon organized banking—bankers' associations—rather than upon you as an individual.

Well, let's look at these points. Of course we are all busy with our day-to-day duties. That's the kind of business we are in and one of the reasons we like it. Nevertheless, every one of us could make the time, if we wished, to discharge our public responsibilities. Each of us could learn more about public affairs, participate in political or civic activities, serve on the school board or the local planning commission, write our Congressmen, teach at the AIB or speak at the local service club. In short, don't just be a banker; do something.

Moreover, regardless of your present duties in the bank you will sooner or later have many opportunities to make suggestions or at least cast your vote with respect to the policies of your own bank in these areas. When these opportunities arise, be prompt with your suggestions and your votes, and unabashed in debate with those who pride themselves on being hardheaded—and are.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE ABA

Secondly, this matter of your individual responsibility versus that of organized banking. Obviously there are certain things which bankers can do more effectively on a cooperative basis, through their associations, than they can acting alone. This is universally recognized. But what is not so widely recognized is the equally obvious fact that the effectiveness of cooperative efforts depends upon the cooperation received from the individual bankers who comprise the association.

It is an illusion to think of a bankers association as somehow having an independent existence of its own. I speak with strong conviction on this point, having been, as you know, for many years a member of the staff of the American Bankers Association. As any ABA staff member can tell you, the success of any association program depends entirely upon the cooperation of individual bankers throughout the country. In the last analysis, the responsibilities of organized banking are the direct responsibilities of its members.

By the same token, this implies that the standards and objectives of the ABA should be very high. They should represent the collective responsibilities of bankers everywhere. They should reflect the finest in American banking.

Obviously the ABA does not presently measure up to these high standards. And now that I no longer have any official connection with the association, I should like to comment briefly on this point. Let me say first that bankers have much to be proud of in the record of the ABA, far more than most of them realize. Few bankers appreciate the devotion to the cause of banking which has been expended over the years by staff members and by bankers who have participated in the ABA's activities. This graduate school is certainly not the least of the ABA accomplishments.

But if we set our standards as high as we should, the ABA has serious shortcomings. It falls far short of what it could be doing. To my mind, its budget is woefully inadequate. There are countless things that need to be done, or done much better, for which funds are not in the budget.

But please don't infer that increasing membership dues in the ABA would solve the public responsibilities of bankers. It most assuredly would not, not unless individual bankers throughout the country are willing to lend leadership and support to forward-looking policies. The shortcomings of the ABA are the shortcomings of its members and no one else. Its potential accomplishments are also those of individual bankers willing to contribute their time and energies to them.

NEEDED: A SENSE OF DEDICATION

In short, gentlemen, the responsibilities of bankers consist of the obligations of each of us as individuals. Every banker has an important part to play. If we perform our parts as we can and should, we can help to strengthen the fabric of our society.

Banking has come a long way since the doghouse days of the great depression. But we still have far to go. We need further to broaden our concept of the banker's role in society and achieve standards of conduct which will set an example for other groups to emulate. We need to cultivate the habit of thinking in terms of the public interest. We need to deepen our social consciousness. This is not Sunday school stuff; it is the first law of modern survival.

Let us remind ourselves again, and frequently, of the grim urgency of our situation, of how much is at stake. The ordeal of the 20th century is far from over. The Communist menace may confront us for generations. This is a global life and death struggle, one in which there is no prize for second best.

It is imperative that we keep our economy strong and help to strengthen free nations everywhere. We must match the fanatical zeal of the Communists with an abiding devotion to our ideals. We must be willing not only to fight for freedom but to work for it, year in and year out. Our leadership in the world will depend upon how well we use our freedom.

These are not lofty abstractions far removed from matters of daily living. To the contrary, they should provide framework and guidance for what we do from day to day. They constitute a challenge to each of us. They offer to each of us an opportunity—to broaden our horizons and to expand our spheres of influence. Will we have the intelligence, the courage, the maturity, and the sense of mission, needed to fulfill these obligations? Will we have the vision and steadfastness—in short, the dedication—required to live up to our broadened responsibilities as bankers?

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleagues in rendering a heartfelt sympathy with the family of the late Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, a most dedicated servant of the public and this Nation.

As his neighbor in the House Office Building, I shall always remember his friendliness, and respect and admire him for his contributions to the functions of the House of Representatives.

During the past several years he has concentrated a supreme and successful effort to effect technological advancement in the field of space. His leadership as first chairman of the major Committee on Science and Astronautics was both brilliant and talented, and reflected his deep concern for the future of the United States.

Though long hours were spent on this work, this 13-times-elected Representative found time to investigate and plan

the development of natural resources, and become the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Through all his responsibilities as have been noted here by my other colleagues, Congressman Brooks was a fine Christian, a temperate judge, and a patriot of highest degree. He was a man of honesty, integrity and rare imagination in his ability to project upon the present scene his desires for an even better Nation of tomorrow.

Few men, upon their passing, can lay claim to a fuller life of concern, faith and friendship toward their fellow man as did this gentleman from Louisiana. The vacancy left by our colleague will, indeed, be felt by all who knew and worked with him.

History of Vending in the United States—75th Anniversary of the Industry—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I herewith offer the third part of "A Concise History of Vending in the U.S.A.," written by G. R. Schreiber, editor of *Vend*, the magazine of the vending industry, to commemorate the 75th anniversary of vending in this country:

A CONCISE HISTORY OF VENDING

For a brief time later, Horn & Hardart operated an automat in Chicago. But this was closed and the company concentrated its attention on New York and Philadelphia. In a very real sense, the automat of 1902 was the forerunner of the automatic cafeterias which now provide complete food service for millions of industrial workers, for hospital staffs, in colleges, and office buildings.

In 1905, the U.S. Post Office took official cognizance of the vending machine. Plagued with inventors and manufacturers who wanted the Post Office to grant them exclusive royalty contracts (such as existed then as now in some European countries), the Department appointed a committee to investigate the merits of the machines. But the conclusion was unfavorable.

In his report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1907, Postmaster General George Von L. Myer (who had just issued a directive to produce stamps in rolls that could be used in machines) wrote as follows: "This method of selling stamps is in use in other countries and the proposition to consider its adoption in the United States has excited no little interest. The use of machines has become so universal and popular in other fields that there seems every reason why they should be adapted to the sale of stamps, stamped envelopes, and postal cards, provided machines can be built which combine the necessary features of moderate expense and absolute accuracy in operation."

Accordingly, the Post Office Department examined a dozen stamp-vending machines. With considerable diplomacy, the Department later reported that nine of the machines had "unquestionable merit" but all failed to measure up to the Department's exacting standards. In 1908, the Department

examined 25 different stamp machines and thought enough of 6 of them to conduct tests at New York, Washington, Baltimore, Indianapolis, and Minneapolis. Since none of the machines was slugproof, the project was abandoned. But the publicity surrounding the tests was such that the principal manufacturers—notably Schermack in Detroit, U.S. Automatic Vending Co. in New York, and the Brinkerhoff Co. in Sedalia, Mo.—began to develop public locations for the machines. That year, too, the Post Office finally began the manufacture of coils containing 500 stamps suitable for use in the machines.

While most vending companies were concentrating their efforts on the design and manufacture of machines, a few hardy pioneers who saw the need for service and maintenance began the Nation's first operating companies. In April 1906, the Franco-Swiss Chocolate Co. was incorporated in New Jersey. It was a holding company with five subsidiaries whose principal business was the installation and maintenance of candy vending machines. Then, as now, packaging posed special problems and Franco-Swiss had to set up its own packaging department to box the candies for sales in the machines.

In Chicago in 1906, 14-year-old Bert Mills, the youngest of M. B. Mills' 13 children, quit school to go to work at his brother's Mills Novelty Co. At that time, Mills was building a variety of vending machines as well as gambling machines which the company catalog called "trade stimulators." Bert Mills, who went on to found a corporation which bore his name and helped pioneer the hot coffee vender, recalled that one of his brother's machines was a 10-selection soda pop vender. The pop was dispensed from 10 5-gallon bottles which were mounted behind a cabinet built in the shape of a barrel.

"In those days, of course," Mills said, "they didn't use paper cups. There was a long trough running along the front of the machine and they had glasses sitting on the trough. At either end of the machine were tanks of water. If you felt like it, you picked up a cup and rinsed it off in water before you used it. But most people didn't bother."

The device was not refrigerated, but "the man who operated the machine put cracked ice on top of the bottles in the morning. In a couple of hours, the ice melted and the drinks got warm. Believe it or not, they sold a lot of drinks."

Doctors, public health officials and some of the public were concerned with the sanitation aspects of the common drinking cup, and in 1908 a company was formed to do something about it. The Public Cup Vendor Co. of New York that year introduced a vending machine which vended an individual drink of water in a paper cup. The price was a penny. Later the company became the Individual Drink Cup Co. and still later the Dixie Cup Co. After a few years, the combination water and cup vender was replaced with a penny vender which sold only cups, but this was the first ancestor of the modern hot and cold drink vending machines.

In 1908, too, R. M. Richardson formed the R. M. Richardson Co. with Zeno chewing gum venders, and thus became the first gum venders, and a match vender and thus became the first vending operating company on the west coast.

The following year, the late Emerson Bolen founded the Northwestern Corp. in the little river town of Morris, Ill. Bolen was typical in many ways of the imaginative mechanic-turned salesman, or salesman turned mechanic if you prefer, who pioneered vending. Born on a farm near Newark, Ohio, Bolen moved as a young man to Marion, Ind., where he graduated from high school and then became a traveling salesman.

Just before the turn of the century, having convinced himself and others of his

salesmanship, Bolen packed his satchel and his sample case and sailed off for south Africa as the sole representative on that continent of the Fireless Cooker Co. and of a firm which made illustrated blackboards. He spent 3 years in Africa, once got himself drafted protestingly into the British Army, came home mostly to persuade his childhood sweetheart to become Mrs. Bolen.

Back in the States, with a new wife, Bolen saw a chance to build a kind of vending machine no one else had hit upon. In those days the saloons provided free kitchen matches for their customers. But the customers were so free and easy with the supply, grabbing up a handful to take along with them, that the matches were eating into many a saloonkeeper's profits. At least, that was the opinion of a friend of Bolen's who ran a saloon in his hometown of Marion.

Why not, Bolen thought, find some way of providing free matches and yet gracefully keep the customers from stuffing their pockets? Out of this thinking came a small, bar-top device, not coin activated, while Bolen called the Yankee. You opened the top of the Yankee and loaded it with 100 or so kitchen matches. Then the top was locked on. When you pushed a lever down, about an inch of matchstick popped out of an opening in the top of the device. You grasped the matchstick and pulled, and as you pulled the match head struck itself against an abrasive and emerged lighted and ready for use. The end of the lever likewise contained a cutter to nip off the end of a cigar.

On August 12, 1909, Bolen and two associates put up \$3,000 to form Northwestern and to market the Yankee. In 9 months they built and sold 100,000 Yankees, at a retail price of \$2, with a 100-percent markup. But the handwriting was on the wall: the kitchen match was giving way to the safety match so that in 1911 Northwestern brought out a penny matchbox vending machine—the first in a long line of venders to bear the company's trademark.

While Bolen was getting Northwestern started, a Dr. Emil Luden, who had been traveling abroad, arrived back in the States with a coin-operated lock he had discovered in Germany. Luden took out U.S. patents on the device and, in 1909, formed the Nik-O-Lok Co. After failing to sell the locks to the outlets where they would be used in washrooms, Luden became discouraged and sold his mechanism to C. C. Van Cleave who became the first president of Nik-O-Lok. The company decided to place its toilet locks on a service and commission basis, and has since grown to be one of the largest vending service organizations in the world.

The years just before World War I were a busy time for the vending machine manufacturers, and an increasing variety of merchandise was being sold in machines. In 1911, the Doehler Die Casting Co., New York, developed machines like the Hoff vender for Wrigley penny gum and for Life Savers; drink cup vending machines for the American Paper Goods Co.; a small counter vending machine, designed to look like a gasoline pump, which dispensed lighter fluid; Sani-Servs paper towel machines and a sanitary napkin vender distributed nationally by West Disinfectant Co.

Early operating companies were busy, too, and there was some tendency toward mergers and consolidations. In 1911, Franco-Swiss and its subsidiaries were absorbed by the Autosales Gum and Chocolate Co. which then controlled 32 merchandise vending operations. This consolidation gave Autosales an estimated 100,000 vending machines.

By the end of World War I, and the beginning of the twenties, the idea of operating companies was well established. The companies would own and service vending machines and pay a commission to the outlets

where they were placed. In Dallas, Tex., trolley cars were fitted out with gum and candy venders, operated with apparent success until a per-machine tax drove them out of business.

A real case study of how vending machines could open new markets and create demand for a specific product came in 1921 through the British Wrigley Co. and its managing director, S. L. Murison. Wrigley had two obstacles to overcome in England: The British were not addicted to gum chewing and British wholesalers and retailers were unwilling to undertake to educate the public. Murison set out to distribute some 500 penny gum vending machines among key British retailers. The retailers were simply to see to it that the machines were kept filled. Wrigley's vending program not only opened a new market for that company, it converted the British to gum chewing as well.

About this time, inventors of vending machines began to think seriously of selling cigarettes through automatic machines. In 1925, three machines were developed which were to have a profound effect on the growth of the U.S. vending industry. All three of the machines were built to sell cigarettes: One by National of St. Louis, another by William Rowe in Los Angeles, and a third by Smoketeria in Detroit. The cigarette vender was the first serious attempt to sell quantities of products at prices in excess of a nickel. At the outset, few people took the cigarette vender seriously and a good many shrewd merchandisers were sure it would fail.

Hymen Goldman once recalled the day Gordon Macke walked into Goldman's tobacco and candy wholesale company in Washington, D.C. Macke had met William Rowe on the west coast, became enthusiastic about Rowe's cigarette machine, and was setting out to establish a cigarette operating business in Washington. Macke came to Goldman as a logical and convenient source of supply for the cigarettes he proposed to vend.

"He told me," Goldman recalled, "that he was going to sell cigarettes through his machines for 15 cents. At that time our retail customers were selling cigarettes for 11 and 12 cents, and I thought he was crazy. No one would pay that much more. But he said they would because the machines were more convenient. I was sure he was wrong and we refused to sell him cigarettes."

Macke, not easily discouraged, arranged to buy cigarettes from some of the wagon jobbers, subwholesalers, whose source of supply was Goldman's wholesale house. Some years later, when Macke had proved his point by installing more than 100 cigarette machines, Goldman purchased the Macke operation and thus started what is now the Macke Vending Co.

In 1926, the first Sodamats, forerunners of the modern soft drink cup machines, appeared in New York and New Jersey amusement parks. These machines were not self-contained devices because they did not contain in a single unit the coin mechanism, cup dispenser, refrigeration system, carbonator and sirup tank. Instead the Sodamats were installed in batteries built into a wall. The units in the battery were fed by one compressor, one carbonator and one pump at the rear, the attendants worked behind the scenes keeping everything in working order. Batteries of Sodamats were installed in Cony Island, Asbury Park, Atlantic City, and New York where they continued to pump out soft drinks long after World War II.

As the 1920's drew to a close there was another wave of mergers and consolidations within the industry. The Autosales Corp., which had been reorganized at the end of World War I, acquired additional subsidiary companies; manufacturing interests were combining their resources, and a new holding company—Consolidated Automatic Merchandising Corp.—appeared on the scene.

CAMCO was the first attempt to establish a truly diversified national operating organization. It was the brainchild of Joseph J. Schermack, who is generally credited with building the first practical postage stamp vending machine.

Schermack left school to begin work as a mechanic in Freeport, Ill., when he was 13 years old. In 1900 he started his own business as a manufacturer of mailing machines, the first of which was placed in Marshall Field & Co., in Chicago. In 1910, Schermack brought out his first profit-sharing stamp vender, a machine which sold either four penny stamps or two 2-penny stamps for a nickel. Until this time, postage stamps had been vended at face value, the idea being that the retailers who owned the machines were providing a service for their customers.

At first, Schermack sold his stamp venders outright to the stores in which they were placed. Schermack formed the Sanitary Postage Service Corp. in September 1926 to install and operate stamp venders. By 1928, Sanitary had some 20,000 of the machines in operation, and a year later claimed to have 30,000. The machines were placed in such well-known establishments as United Cigar, Schulte, Liggett, and other chainstores, as well as in thousands of independent outlets.

In August 1928, with considerable fanfare in the public press, Sanitary became a division of the newly formed CAMCO. Schermack was named president, while Financier A. J. Sack became chairman. The board of directors of CAMCO, which immediately announced plans to distribute its stock to the public, included such famous names as the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt. CAMCO announced that it was entering complete vending service. In addition to Sanitary Postage, CAMCO controlled the General Vending Corp. of Virginia, Automatic Merchandising Corp. of America, Schermack Corp. of America, and Remington Service Machines, Inc. CAMCO management announced it was operating 36,000 penny weighing scales, 30,000 stamp vending machines, and 25,000 nut venders and that it was moving quickly into candy and cigarette vending. Within 5 years, the company's prospectus told potential investors, CAMCO would have 1,500,000 machines and would be making fantastic profits.

The best known of CAMCO's installations was a battery of 15 cigarette machines, with 3 changemakers, installed in the United Cigar Store at 33d and Broadway in New York. Later the machines were fitted out with phonograph devices which repeated "Thank you" after customers had inserted their coins.

The idea for CAMCO sounds amazingly modern since the organizers intended to attract other large vending companies to merge and intended likewise to integrate manufacturing of equipment and operating.

Mr. A. Granat, vice president of United Cigar and one of the organizers of CAMCO, said in an interview in 1929: "After we got the company started, we began to discuss the probability of consolidating the different aspects of our business, namely, the manufacturing, the servicing, and the selling. Therefore, we formed the general organization we now have, which overshadows all of the companies which heretofore have been engaged in the business of vending merchandise by machines."

After the corporation was formed, as Mr. Schermack later told a reporter, "It was then our good fortune to meet Mr. F. J. Lisman, of F. J. Lisman & Co., a banker who had been a member of the New York Stock Exchange for over 30 years and who, together with excellent maturity of judgment, preserves a wonderful, youthful attitude toward new ideas." With Lisman's help and guidance, CAMCO prepared a 4-page prospectus, projecting a rosy picture of sales and profits

into the millions of dollars. In the dark depression days of 1933, CAMCO went into bankruptcy. Some of its holdings were sold off, others were simply liquidated.

In Chicago, in 1929, a 44-year-old automotive parts manufacturer named Nathaniel Leverone got on a penny weighing scale while waiting for the elevated train at Wilson Avenue. Leverone, who prided himself on his trim appearance, blanched at the reading on the scale: 200 pounds. He took out another penny, walked to the end of the platform and got on a second scale. The reading: 70 pounds. Many years later, Leverone said this experience prompted him to get into the vending business. "Why in the devil, I thought, haven't some honest men seen the opportunity in these things?" That same year, Leverone and 11 associates put up \$5,000 each to start Canteen Co. Later, they put in another \$5,000 each.

A Letter to Look Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I wish to enclose a letter which I wrote to Look magazine:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1961.

Mr. CHESTER MORRISON,
Look Senior Editor,
Look Magazine,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: This letter is with reference to your article on the John Birch Society published in the September 26 issue of Look. This is to advise you that I am not now nor have I ever been a member of the John Birch Society. It would have been perfectly simple for you to have determined this by a telephone call to me. However, you appear to be so dedicated to carrying out the anti-anti-Communist program of Gus Hall, chairman of the Communist Party of the United States of America, that true facts are of little consequence to you.

In August 1960, I wrote a letter to Mr. Robert Welch telling him that some of his intemperate statements would open the John Birch Society to a massive attack.

I fully support the patriotic goals of the John Birch Society but I do not agree with the statements made by Mr. Welch in the Politician.

At the last convention of all of the Communist Parties held in Moscow on December 10, 1960, formal recognition was taken of the damage which the anti-Communist organizations were inflicting on the international Communist conspiracy and that the program for 1961 was to be the total destruction of these anti-Communist organizations. Gus Hall, chairman of the Communist Party of the United States of America, was to implement this program in the United States and he found many willing transmission lines through the public media to do this.

Because of some of Mr. Welch's statements, the John Birch Society was vulnerable and became the first target of attack, and I am not too surprised to find Look to be a willing helper in this program.

I herewith demand a retraction of that part of the article which named me as a member of that society.

Yours very truly,

JAMES B. UTT,
Member of Congress.

U.N. Brutality in Katanga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, we all know about the current war in Katanga between the Katangans and the United Nations. I wonder if we are all aware of the brutal savage-like efforts of the U.N. to subdue Katanga and make her part of the Congo.

I read in the September 15, 1961, issue of the Chicago Daily Tribune a news item which reports actions of the U.N. in Katanga which are utterly shocking. In this report, Richard Williams, a correspondent of the British Broadcasting Corp., tells of an instance where U.N. forces fired point blank at a Red Cross ambulance, wounding the attendants in the ambulance. The U.N. is supposed to be an organization of peace-loving nations whose goal is to achieve peace and tolerance among nations. The actions of the U.N. in Katanga cause one to wonder if the U.N., in fact, is furthering man's inhumanity to man.

In my opinion, every Member of Congress should have an opportunity to read the news item to which I refer. I, therefore, wish to have it printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

U.N. GUILTY OF SAVAGERY, BRITON SAYS

LONDON, September 14.—A British newsman covering the United Nations takeover in Katanga tonight accused U.N. forces of brutal savagery.

Richard Williams, correspondent for the British Broadcasting Corp., said in a report from Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, that the U.N. action was a terrible miscalculation.

Williams, wounded in the foot yesterday during the fighting in Elisabethville, said the U.N. miscalculation had in effect developed into a national war.

POST OFFICE A FORT

Williams said that U.N. troops "have turned the Elisabethville post office into a fortress, partly surrounded by the Katangan army."

"United Nations machineguns on the terrace and balconies of the Red Cross hospital 60 yards away were firing heavily all morning," he added.

"This morning, when a group of journalists approached the hospital, they were greeted by a long burst of machinegun fire from armored cars manned by Irish troops," Williams said.

STREETS DESERTED

"The streets are deserted. Anything that moves is shot at. Armored cars stand menacingly at street corners.

"Few people slept here last night. Heavy machinegun fire spat at the hidden enemy. Mortar bombs burst around us and bazookas tore into offices and private houses when Katangan troops tried to retake the post office.

Williams said that this morning a white painted, clearly marked Red Cross ambulance stalled in the middle of the main square of the capital. The driver and stretcherbearer got out.

"Indian troops in the post office immediately opened fire at almost point blank range," he said. "They [the ambulance

men] collapsed on the road seriously wounded.

"This is the second time in 24 hours I have seen United Nations troops fire on a Red Cross vehicle.

"OBSERVERS APPALLED

"All the rules of war have gone by the board in this campaign. This morning the Belgian head of the Red Cross told me he had asked Brig. Singappa Raja, the United Nations commander, to remove all machineguns from the hospital.

"He was told they would stay there. The hospital was a strategic post. It would not be abandoned.

"All foreign observers are appalled at the unrelenting severity of the United Nations assault. I am sorry to say that I have personally seen Indian troops act with the brutal savagery which is quite indefensible."

A Review of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the September 1961 issue of Fortune magazine there is a very thorough report about what happened during the recent Cuban affair. The journalist who researched the material for this article for many weeks and who wrote this comprehensive study is Charles J. V. Murphy, the senior editor of Fortune magazine in Washington. The editors of Fortune have stated that they are publishing this account "Cuba: The Record Set Straight," for one purpose—to set the record straight for concerned Americans. In this spirit we should carefully study the many facts and anecdotes which Mr. Murphy has so thoroughly pulled together.

Regretfully, President Kennedy has said about this article:

This is the most inaccurate of all the articles that have appeared on Cuba (August 30 press conference).

It is unfortunate that the Kennedy administration attacks the integrity of the author instead of dealing factually with the matter in hand. I believe that issues and studies are more important than name-calling and play on personalities. I would like to say about Mr. Murphy that he is one of the most experienced, thoughtful, careful senior journalists writing in Washington today. For 20 years his articles, reports, and books have been most highly valued by thoughtful individuals. He is an acknowledged expert in the fields of military strategy, economic policy, and foreign affairs. He has traveled all over the world obtaining material for his writings. His firsthand experiences include accompanying Adm. Richard Byrd on some of his Antarctic expeditions. He has been decorated by the U.S. Government. Three words have always characterized Mr. Murphy's career as a journalist, regardless of whether one agreed or disagreed with one particular

aspect of an article. These are integrity, scholarship, and courage.

Because Mr. Murphy's finding about Cuba deserve the closest study by legislators and editors, I submit this article for the RECORD:

CUBA: THE RECORD SET STRAIGHT

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

Not long ago, at President Kennedy's daily staff meeting, the special assistant for national security affairs, McGeorge Bundy, opened the proceedings by noting, "Sir, we have four matters up for discussion this morning." The President was not in a zesty mood. "Are these problems which I inherited?" he asked. "Or are they problems of our own making?" "A little of both," was Bundy's tactful answer.

The exchange revealed a new and saving humility. Some days after this incident, Kennedy addressed the Nation on the subject of Berlin. The ebullience, the air of self-assurance that marked his first months in office had gone. He spoke earnestly to his countrymen but his words were also aimed at Premier Khrushchev, who up to this point had appeared not to be listening. This time Kennedy did get through to Moscow; and any lingering doubt about the American determination to defend Berlin was dispelled by the response of the American people. The President's will to stand firm was clear, and the Nation was with him.

Nevertheless, in any full review of John Kennedy's first months in office, there must be reported a failure in administration that will continue to inhibit and trouble American foreign policy until it is corrected. This failure raises a fair question: whether Kennedy has yet mastered the governmental machinery, whether he is well and effectively served by some of his close advisers, and whether they understand the use of power in world politics. The matter is of vital importance; in the crises that will inevitably arise around the world—in the Middle East, in Africa, in the Far East, in central Europe—the U.S. Government must be in top form, and possibly even, as Kennedy himself suggested, act alone.

Administrative confusions came to light most vividly in the Cuban disaster. That story is told here for the first time in explicit detail. It is told against the background of the U.S. reversal in Laos, which in itself should not be underestimated: Laos, once in the way of becoming a buffer for its non-Communist neighbors, is all but finished; now, in South Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, a stout friend of the United States, is under murderous attack by Communist guerrillas; the U.S. loss of face is being felt from the Philippines to Pakistan, and in the long run the damage may prove to be even more costly than that caused by Cuba.

Let us turn back then to the train of events, beginning with Laos, that culminated in the disaster in the Bay of Pigs. Fortune is publishing the account for one purpose—to set the record straight for concerned Americans.

Kennedy, from the day he took office, was loath to act in Laos. He was confident that he understood the place and use of power in the transactions of the Nation, but he was baffled by this community of elephants, parasols, and pagodas. Then, too, he brought to office a general surmise that our long-range prospects of holding the new and weak nations of southeast Asia in the Western camp were doubtful in the extreme. In this respect, he was leaning toward the Lippmann-Stevenson-Fulbright view of strategy. This school holds that U.S. power is over-committed in southeast Asia, and that the proper aim for U.S. diplomacy there should be to reduce local frictions by molding the new states as true neutrals.

The U.S. position in Laos had become acute while Dwight Eisenhower was still in

office. Eisenhower must therefore bear a considerable part of the blame for the U.S. failure; he let a situation go from bad to worse, and indeed he apologized to Kennedy for leaving "a mess," and that it might take the intervention of U.S. troops to redeem it. There had been a moment when the struggle in Laos had turned in favor of the pro-U.S. forces under General Phoumi Nosavan, the former Defense Minister. In a series of small but decisive engagements, more by maneuver than by shooting, Phoumi eventually took the capital, Vientiane, early in December, but at this point the Russians intervened openly on the side of the Communist faction, the Pathet Lao. In concert with a large-scale push by well-trained troops from North Vietnam, they introduced a substantial airlift into northern Laos (an operation that still is continuing).

The collapse of the Royal Lao Army then became inevitable unless the United States came in with at least equal weight on Phoumi's side. One obvious measure was to put the airlift out of business. The job could have been done by volunteer pilots and the challenge would at least have been established, at not too high an initial risk for the United States, how far the Russians were prepared to go. Another measure would have been to bring SEATO forces into the battle, as the SEATO treaty provided.

In the end, Eisenhower decided to sheer away from both measures. The State Department was opposed to stirring up India and the other Asian neutrals. Secretary of State Christian Herter agreed in principle that the independence of Laos had to be maintained, yet he was unable to bring to heel his own desk officers and the policy planners, who were apprehensive that even a limited military action would wreck the possibility of some kind of political accommodation with Moscow. The policy shapers, especially in State, hung back from any sequence of actions that might have committed U.S. policy on the central issue: that Laos was worth fighting for. Even the modest additional support that the Defense Department tried to extend to Phoumi's U.S.-equipped battalions in the field during the last weeks of the Eisenhower administration was diluted by reason of the conflict between Defense and State. Under Secretary of Defense James Douglas was later to say, "By the time a message to the field had been composed in Washington, it had ceased to be an operational order and had become a philosophical essay." And a vexed Phoumi was to exclaim that the reasoning of the American Ambassador, Winthrop Brown, was beyond his simple oriental mind. "His Excellency insists that my troops be rationed to a few rounds of ammunition per man. He tells me that I must not start a world war. But the enemy is at my throat."

After the responsibility passed to Kennedy in January, Phoumi's position was still not completely hopeless, if he had been able to get adequate help. But early in March a sudden Communist descent drove him off a position commanding the principal highway in northern Laos. That unfortunate action was the turning point in his part of the war. For the relative ease with which it was done raised in Washington the question of whether Phoumi's troops had the will to fight.

By then Kennedy was committed to the Cuba operation. He therefore now had to reckon with the very real possibility, were U.S. forces to become involved in Laos, of having to back off from Cuba.

At this juncture Kennedy's foremost need was a clear reading of Soviet intentions. For this he turned to his "demonologists," the New Frontier's affectionate term for its Soviet experts. The most influential among them—Charles E. Bohlen, State's senior Sovietologist, and Ambassador Llewellyn

Thompson at Moscow—were agreed that Khrushchev personally had too much respect for U.S. power to stir it into action, as Stalin had carelessly done in Korea. Yet, while Khrushchev was plainly indulging his preference for "salami" tactics it was impossible to judge how big a slice he was contemplating, or whether he was being pushed by Mao Tse-tung. The only reading available to Kennedy was, in a word, ambiguous. Maybe Khrushchev was moving into a vacuum in Laos just to keep out Mao. If so, then the least chancy response for the United States was to assume that Khrushchev would be satisfied with a thin slice in Laos, and to maneuver him toward a compromise—a neutral government in which, say, the Pathet Lao would have some minor representation.

This course was urged by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and also was being pressed by Prime Minister Macmillan in London. It came to be known as track 2. It was intended to lead to a cease-fire followed by negotiation. Oppositely, the Joint Chiefs of Staff still believed, as they did under Eisenhower, that the military challenge demanded a military showdown: action by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, under which a mixed allied force, including Americans, would move into Laos and take over the defense of the important cities, thereby freeing the Royal Lao Army to move into the field without risk of being sapped by subversion in the rear. This option was labeled "track 1," and it was favored as well by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and his Deputy Roswell Gilpatric.

While Kennedy favored track 2 and supported a conciliatory note that Macmillan sent to Moscow, he decided he also had to make a show of starting down track 1, in case the political gamble failed. He permitted himself a dramatic gesture. At his televised press conference on March 23, he addressed himself somberly to a map of Laos—a country "far away" but in a world that is "small." Its independence, he went on, "runs with the safety of us all," and in language that all but told Khrushchev that he was in for a fight, he implied that the United States was preparing to go to its defense. There was, meanwhile a tremendous deployment of U.S. forces in the Far East, involving the 7th Fleet and Marine combat units on Okinawa. The Army's strategic-strike units in the United States were made ready. A belated effort was made to buck up Phoumi's forces with an increased flow of fighting gear. U.S. military "advisers" went into the field with his battalions. Against this background, on March 26, Kennedy went to Key West and met Macmillan, who was on a visit to the West Indies. The Prime Minister made it clear that Britain considered Laos hardly worth a war, and wanted no part in a SEATO action. (De Gaulle, in a separate exchange, had told Kennedy flatly that France would not fight in Laos.)

From that point on, the idea of a military showdown in Laos looked less and less attractive to the President. He did issue one warning to the Russians that might have been construed as having a military tone. Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko called at the White House and Kennedy took him into the rose garden, beyond earshot of his staff, and said, "The United States does not intend to stand idly by while you take over Laos." But that was the last run along track 1.

By then, Rusk was in Bangkok for a meeting of the SEATO powers, still hoping to extract from the meeting at least a strong statement that would condemn the Soviet intervention in Laos and reassert the determination of the SEATO powers to defend the new nations of southeast Asia. In this mission Rusk failed. None of the ranking Democratic Congressmen, or Republicans

spoke up in favor of intervention. Moreover, when Kennedy pressed the military chiefs for specific recommendations, he got divided answers. Gen. Thomas White, then Air Force Chief of Staff, and Adm. Arleigh Burke, then Chief of Naval Operations, were both confident that the Communist penetration could be defeated and Laos saved. They said that since the Communists would throw far more manpower into the battle, the U.S. war plan would have to include the possible use of tactical nuclear weapons on a limited scale. They maintained, however, that a clear U.S. resolution to employ nuclear weapons, if there was a need, might in itself discourage further Communist penetration. Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. George H. Decker, Army Chief of Staff, had much less confidence in the U.S. ability to stop the Communists. Lemnitzer expressed the apprehension that U.S. military action in Laos might be matched by Red China and Russia in a fast reopening of the war in Korea. Two such wars, by his calculation, might require no fewer than 20 U.S. divisions, more than the Army had in its entire order of battle, as well as general mobilization to support them.

"In effect," Kennedy demanded, "you're telling me that I can't do anything—without starting a nuclear war?" This, he swore, he'd never do, which by itself was a startling reversal of a fundamental premise of the Eisenhower strategy: that U.S. forces would have recourse to nuclear tactical weapons on whatever scale the pursuit of U.S. objectives required. The White House, while conceding to the Communists the option of uninhibited escalation, would not tolerate even a limited escalation on the nuclear side by our own forces. Any military move in Laos therefore seemed hopeless.

The fear of the nuclear escalation factor became the sanction for the policy that was pursued thereafter. In light of this, the scene of Kennedy addressing himself to the map of Laos, in his first public appearance as Commander in Chief, is now memorable for its fleeting revelation of a spirited man who was eager to present himself as a strong President, but who all too quickly turned unsure of his principal resource of power.

The Chiefs, although they took different views of the risks of the Laos situation, were fundamentally agreed on a central point. And that was that the United States had to be prepared to employ tactical nuclear weapons. But Kennedy and his civilian strategists, moving away from the nuclear base of the Eisenhower strategy, read into their professional differences a bankruptcy of means and doctrine. The low esteem in which Kennedy began to hold the military leaders whom he inherited from the Eisenhower administration has not been concealed.

Secretary of Defense McNamara is rewriting the Eisenhower strategic doctrine, in collaboration with the political scientists at the White House and State. The backing away from nuclear strategy, which ended in the U.S. retreat in Laos, is now being formalized by McNamara. (His prescription will call for a conventional base for NATO strategy in the defense of Berlin.)

So there was, by early April, even as Laos was slipping farther and farther below Kennedy's horizon, a breakdown of communication between the political and the military sides of the Government, and this would contribute largely to the failure of Kennedy's next venture.

The Cuban affair has been called the American Suez. In the sense that Suez, too, was an utter fiasco, the bracketing is wryly accurate. There is, however, a clear difference between the two operations. Ill-managed as it was, the Suez invasion would have succeeded had not Eisenhower used the influence of the United States to bring three allies—

Britain, France, and Israel—to a humiliating halt. (It should be recorded that neither Britain, France, nor Israel made any critical comment on the U.S. excursion in Cuba.) In Cuba the defeat was wholly self-inflicted. Even as the expedition was creeping into the Bay of Pigs, just before midnight of April 16, the political overseers back in Washington were in the process of knocking out of the battle plan the final, irreducible element needed for victory.

If the U.S. military are without a peer in any one technique of warfare, it is in putting forces ashore across a hostile beach. For the Bay of Pigs, all the necessary means were at Kennedy's hand. It was, by the standards of Gen. David M. Shoup's Marines, an elementary amphibious operation in less than battalion strength. And, indeed, as a tactical exercise, it was well devised and daringly and successfully led. But after the strategists at the White House and State had finished plucking it apart, it became an operation that would have disgraced even the Albanians. When Kennedy looked around for the blundered, he found him everywhere and nowhere. Practically everybody in his inner group of policy movers and shakers had been in on the planning. Only after the disaster was upon them did he and his men realize that a venture which was essentially a military one had been fatally compromised in order to satisfy political considerations. One not unfriendly official who also served under Eisenhower was later to observe: "Cuba was a terrific jolt to this new crowd because it exposed the fact that they hadn't really begun to understand the meaning and consequences of action—the use or misuse of power, in other words. They had blamed Ike's apparent inaction on indecision and plain laziness. Cuba taught them that action, any kind of serious action, is hard and certainly no safe business for amateurs."

The idea for the invasion had taken root during the early summer of 1960. By then, thousands of defectors from Castro's Cuba were in the United States. Many of them were professional soldiers. The job of organizing and training them was given to the Central Intelligence Agency, as the Government's principal mechanism for mounting covert operations of this sort. It became and remained to the end the specific responsibility of one of the CIA's top deputies, Richard M. Bissell, a former economist who is also a highly practical executive. Among his other first-class accomplishments, Bissell had masterminded the U-2 operation, which was, until it finally missed, as one day it had to, the most economical and comprehensive innovation in espionage in modern times.

Training camps for the exiles were set up in a district in western Guatemala offering some privacy. The original idea was to feed the recruits back into Cuba, to reinforce the several thousand anti-Castro guerrillas already established in the mountains. Toward the autumn, however, a more ambitious and riskier project came under tentative consideration. Castro was organizing large formations of militia and was obviously bent on crushing the counterrevolutionary movement before the Cuban populace caught fire. With a view to saving the movement, it was proposed to build up an invasion force big enough to seize and to hold on the Cuban shore a beachhead sufficiently deep for the expedition to proclaim a provisional government, and so provide a rallying base for the discontented. By this time, too, the rudiments of an anti-Castro air force were in training nearby. The planes, however, were all obsolete—mostly propeller-driven B-26's, twin-engine bombers of World War II vintage that had been redeemed from the Air Force's graveyard. Associated with them was a troop-carrying squadron with which a small detachment of paratroopers was training.

During the summer and fall of 1960, Eisenhower from time to time personally reviewed the scheme. In late November, the last time it came up for his comprehensive review, an operational plan had not yet crystallized; no timetable for action had been set. Across the Potomac at the Pentagon, Under Secretary of Defense Douglas, who was charged with quasi-military operations under the non-committal category of collateral cold war activities, was keeping a watchful eye on the project, and releasing such military talent and gear as the CIA requisitioned. Neither he nor the Joint Chiefs of Staff (whose connection with the project remained informal at this stage) believed that much good would flow from an attack made by Cubans alone. For one thing, the resources then available permitted the training of only 300 men or so, and the air unit had but a dozen planes. This was hardly enough to bring down a tough, well-armed regime, and Douglas repeatedly counseled more realism in the planning. Indeed, it was taken for granted by Douglas and the others directly concerned that a landing in force could not possibly be brought off unless the expedition was shepherded to the beach by the U.S. Navy (either openly or in disguise), and covered by air power in whatever amount might be necessary. Eisenhower, the commander of Normandy, understood this well enough.

YOU MAY HAVE TO SEND TROOPS IN

It became obvious toward the end of 1960 that Ike would be out of office well before an effective force would be ready. So the decision as to how big the show should be, and how conspicuous should be the U.S. share, and in what role, was no longer his to make. Given the relaxed attitude at the White House, the military chiefs also relaxed; military concern for the enterprise sank to the "Indians"—from the four-star level to the colonels on the Joint Staff who had been advising the CIA in such matters as training and tactics. Bissell was encouraged, on the one hand, to go forward with preparations for an invasion, but he was cautioned to be ready to fall back to the more modest objective of simply generating a supply of reinforcements for the anti-Castro forces in the mountains.

Before Eisenhower was fully rid of his responsibility, however, a number of disquieting developments combined to impart to the enterprise an air of emergency. It was established that Castro was to start receiving, early in 1961, substantial deliveries of Soviet jet fighters, and that pilots to man them were already being trained in Czechoslovakia. From all indications, these would provide him, by early summer, with an air force that would be more than enough to extinguish the last chance of a successful invasion by Cuban exiles; it would be by all odds the most powerful air force in Latin America. Two other developments were scarcely less worrisome. Castro was making progress in his systematic destruction of his enemies in the mountains, upon whose cooperation the invasion counted, and there was no way, save by an over air supply, to get guns and ammunition to them. The stability of the exile movement itself was, moreover, coming into question. Warring political factions threatened to split their ranks, and men who had trained long and painstakingly were impatient over the failure of their American advisers to set a sailing date. The feeling took hold of them and their American sponsors that it was to be in the spring or never.

After his election, Kennedy had been briefed fairly frequently on the Cuban situation, along with that in Laos. As his hour of authority approached, the question of what to do about Cuba was increasingly on his mind. The problem had a personal angle. In his fourth television debate with Richard Nixon, he had sharply blamed the Eisenhower administration for permitting communism to seize a base there, "only 90 miles off the coast

of the United States." He discussed Cuba, along with Laos, at length in both of his pre-inaugural talks with Eisenhower, and by his stipulation. Ike was inclined to rank Cuba below Laos in terms of urgency, but Cuba clearly worried him. In their second conversation Ike said: "It's already a bad situation. You may have to send troops in."

THE FIRST NECESSITY: CONTROL OF THE AIR

On taking office, Kennedy at once called for a detailed briefing on the condition and prospects of the U.S.-fostered operation. This information was supplied by Allen W. Dulles, the Director of the CIA, and by Bissell. After Kennedy had heard them out he decided that he had to have from the Joint Chiefs of Staff a technical opinion of the feasibility of the project. It is at this point that the locus of responsibility begins to be uncertain.

The operation was not a Department of Defense responsibility. Only once before, in early January, had the chiefs formally reviewed the plan, at Eisenhower's invitation. Now they were asked only for an appreciation of its validity. The enterprise, moreover, had expanded considerably in scope and aim in the past few months. With more than 100,000 Cuban refugees in the United States, recruiting had stepped up, and the organizers were at this point aiming at a landing force of about 1,000 men. An operational plan for a landing on the south coast of Cuba, near the town of Trinidad, was finally beginning to jell. There the country was open, with good roads leading into the Escambray Mountains and the needed link-up with the indigenous guerrillas. Also cranked into the plan were ingenious schemes—a barrage of radiobroadcasts from nearby islands and showers of pamphlets from airplanes—intended to galvanize the anti-Castro Cubans in the cities and villages into demonstrations as the invaders struck. It was never explicitly claimed by the CIA that a general uprising was immediately in the cards; the intention was to sow enough chaos during the first hours to prevent Castro from smashing the invasion on the beach. Once the beachhead was consolidated, however, and if fighting gear went forward steadily to the guerrillas elsewhere in Cuba, the planners were confident that a mass revolt could be stimulated.

Finally, the plan still assumed that U.S. military help would be on call during the landing. Castro's air force consisted of not quite two-score planes—a dozen or so obsolete B-26's, plus about the same number of obsolete British Sea Furies, also slow, propeller-driven airplanes. But in addition there were 7 or 8 T-33 jet trainers, the remnants of an earlier U.S. transaction with the Batista government, so the force was not the pushover it appeared at first glance. Armed with rockets, these jets would be more than a match in a battle for the exiles' B-26's. The scheme was to destroy them on the ground in advance of the landing, by a series of attacks on Castro's airfields; should the T-33's escape the first surprise blow, there would be ample opportunity to catch them later on the ground while they were being refueled after an action. In any event, a U.S. carrier would be close by, below the horizon, and one or two of its tactical jets could presumably supply whatever quick and trifling help might be required in an emergency.

It stood to reason that, considering how small the landing party was, the success of the operation would hinge on the B-26's controlling the air over the beachhead. And the margins that the planners accepted were narrow to begin with. The B-26's were to operate from a staging base in a Central American country more than 500 miles from Cuba. The round trip would take better than 6 hours, and that would leave the planes with fuel for only 45 minutes of

action, for bombing and air cover, over Cuba. In contrast, Castro's air force could be over the beachhead and the invaders' ships in a matter of minutes, which would increase his relative air advantage manifold. Hence the absolute necessity of knocking out Castro's airpower, or at least reducing it to impotence, by the time the ground battle was joined.

This, in general terms, was the plan the Chiefs reviewed for Kennedy. The assumptions concerning the possibilities of an anti-Castro uprising not being in their jurisdiction, they took these at face value. They judged the tactical elements sound and, indeed, they accorded the operation a high probability of success. They were allowed to appraise the training and the equipment of the forces. A team of officers was sent to Guatemala. On the basis of its report, the Chiefs made several recommendations, but again their assessment was favorable.

Late in January, Kennedy authorized the CIA to lay on the invasion plan, but he warned that he might call the whole operation off if he had a change of mind as to its wisdom. D-day was tentatively fixed for March 1 but this proved impossible to meet. For one thing, it took some time to organize the quarrelsome exiles in New York and Miami into a workable coalition that would sponsor the expedition. For another, it was decided that a battalion of about 1,400 men was needed to secure a beachhead, and that the force, which called itself the Cuban Brigade, should be beefed up generally. In consequence of these developments, the target date kept slipping until it finally came firm as April 17.

It has since been reported that the President was inwardly skeptical of the operation from the start but just why has never been clear—whether he judged the force too small to take on Castro, or because he was reluctant to take on so soon a nasty job that was bound to stir up an international ruckus, however it came out. Some of his closest advisers, in any case, were assailed by sinking second thoughts. What bothered them was the "immorality" of masked aggression. They recoiled from having the United States employ subterfuge in striking down even so dangerous an adversary as Castro, and they were almost unanimously opposed to having the United States do the job in the open. Even with the best of luck, there would certainly be a flutter among the six leading Latin American States, which, with the exception of Venezuela, had refused to lend themselves to any form of united action against Castro. And the repercussion would scarcely be less embarrassing among the neutralists of Asia and Africa, whose good opinion Kennedy's advisers were most eager to cultivate. And so the emphasis at the White House and State began to move away from a concern with the military considerations—the things needed to make the enterprise work—and to become preoccupied with tinkering they hoped would soften its political impact on the neutral nations.

THE DISMEMBERING BEGINS

The "immorality" of the intervention found its most eloquent voice before the President during a meeting in the State Department on April 4, only 13 days before the date set for the invasion. (Stewart Alsop told part of the story in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.) The occasion was Bissell's final review of the operation, and practically everybody connected with high strategy was on hand—Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, General Lemnitzer, CIA Chief Allen Dulles, as well as Bundy, Paul Nitze, Kennedy's specialist on strategic planning at the Pentagon, Thomas Mann, then Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, and three of Kennedy's specialists in Latin American

matters—Adolf Berle, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Richard Goodwin. There was also one outsider, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who had been Kennedy's favorite choice for Secretary of State, and whose support he wanted. After Bissell had completed his briefing and Dulles had summed up the risks and prospects, FULBRIGHT spoke and denounced the proposition out of hand: it was the wrong thing for the United States to get involved in.

Kennedy chose not to meet this issue. Instead, he quickly noted certain practical considerations and then, going around the table, he asked various of his advisers whether they thought the operation should go forward. Without exception, the answer was "Yes." Berle was particularly outspoken. He declared that "a power confrontation" with communism in the Western Hemisphere was inevitable anyhow. As for this enterprise, "Let 'er rip" was his counsel. Mann, who previously had been on the fence, now spoke up for the operation. Rusk, too, said he was for it, in answer to the President's direct question, but as would presently be manifest, he privately had no heart for it. Two other men among the President's senior foreign policy advisers, not present at the meeting, shared FULBRIGHT's feelings: Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, and Adlai Stevenson, with the United Nations in New York, who soon came to know in a general way that something distasteful was afoot. In deference to these views, Kennedy—either at the meeting or soon afterward—made two separate rulings that were to contribute to the fatal dismemberment of the whole plan. First, U.S. airpower would not be on call at any time: the obsolescent B-26's flown by "our" Cubans would be on their own. Second, the B-26's could be used in only two strikes before the invasion—first on D-minus-2 days (April 15) and again on the morning of the landing. Although these limitations clearly lengthened the risks, Lemnitzer did not dispute them, nor did Bissell's own military advisers; they were confident that if the B-26's missed the T-33's on the first go, they would surely catch them on the second.

During the few remaining days, Kennedy drew his circle of advisers more tightly around him. Apart from Bundy and Rostow, the only White House advisers who remained privy to the development of the operation were the Latin-American experts—Adolf Berle and Schlesinger. Lemnitzer and, of course, Allen Dulles were in and out of Kennedy's office. But the doubts of Rusk and FULBRIGHT and of others were all the while imperceptibly converging on the President and, bit by bit, an operation that was marginal to begin with was so truncated as to guarantee its failure.

The embarkation of the expedition was scheduled to start on April 10. This was, in itself, quite a job. Some half-dozen small steamers were collected for the first movement, together with a number of tactical landing craft. The takeoff point was a port on the Caribbean, several hundred miles from the training area in Guatemala, and the transfer of the Cuban brigade was done by air and at night, through 4 nights, in the interest of secrecy. The gear aboard the ships was enough to supply the landing force through 10 days of battle, and also to equip the thousands of guerrillas expected to be recruited after the beachhead was gained.

Only a week before the embarkation, and indeed only a day or so before the last go-around at the State Department, another serious change was made in the invasion plan. At the insistence of the State Department, Trinidad was eliminated as the target landing area. State's reasons were complex. Rusk decided that the entire operation had to be kept unspectacular and minimize the

overtures of the U.S. role as much as possible. That required shifting the attack to a less populated and less accessible area, where Castro's reaction might be slower and less effective. Rusk and his own advisers were also anxious to be rid at all possible speed of the incubus of responsibility for mounting the operation in Central America, anxious that the B-26's should be based as rapidly as possible on Cuba. The only vulnerable airfield capable of taking the planes was one in poor condition near the Bay of Pigs, on the Zapata Peninsula, about 100 miles to the west of Trinidad. Here the countryside was quite deserted and, to succeed at all, the invaders had to seize and hold two narrow causeways leading across a swamp that was impassable on either side. These actions did not end the last-minute curtailments directed by the White House. Even the arrangements for arousing the Cuban populace and trying to stampede Castro's militia with leaflet raids and radio-broadcasts were struck from the plan, and again because State was afraid that they would be too obvious a showing of the U.S. hand. On April 12, while the convoy was heading north, Kennedy was impelled to announce at a press conference that the United States would not intervene with force in Cuba. Rusk made sure the idea got home by repeating the same guarantee on the morning of the invasion. The effect of this was to serve notice on the Cubans in Cuba, who were known to be waiting for an encouraging signal from the United States that whatever they might be tempted to try would be at their own risk.

THE POLITICIANS TAKE COMMAND

Clear to the end, Kennedy retained tight control of the enterprise. As each new sequence of action came up for his final approval—the go signal for the embarkation, then for the preinvasion air strike on the morning of April 15, he came to his decisions quickly and firmly. All the way, however, he reserved the option to stop the landing short of the beach. He kept asking how late the enterprise might be reversed without making it look as if Castro had called an American bluff. He was told: noon on Sunday, April 16, when the invasion force would be 11 hours of steaming from the Bay of Pigs. The Sunday deadline found Kennedy in the Virginia countryside, at Glen Ora; only then did he raise his finger from the hold button. As he did so, he noted with relief that no other unfavorable factors had materialized. He was mistaken. At dawn of the day before, by the timetable, the B-26's, having flown undetected through the night from their Central American staging base, appeared over Cuba and bombed the three fields on which Castro's ready air was deployed. (The attack was, on the whole, highly successful. Half of Castro's B-26's and Sea Furies, and four of his T-33 jets were blown up or damaged and so removed from the imminent battle.) The story was put out that Castro's own pilots, in the act of defecting, had attacked their own airfields. This was a gloss, to say the least; the attackers were indeed defectors from Castro, but they had defected long before. Later that afternoon, at the United Nations, after the Cuban Foreign Minister, Raul Roa, had charged that the attack was "a prologue" to a U.S. invasion, Adlai Stevenson arose and swore that the planes were Castro's.

From this hapless moment on, Stevenson's role becomes unclear. There was a subsequent published report that he intervened to block the second strike. Stevenson has flatly denied, and continues to deny, that he even knew about the second strike, let alone that he demanded that it be called off. But there was little doubt about his unhappiness over the course of events in the Caribbean and he conveyed these feelings to Washington. Before Sunday was over Bundy was to fly to New York, to see Steven-

son (Bundy said) and still wearing in his haste to be off, sneakers and sports clothes. This sudden errand followed a shattering order that went out to Bissell.

It was Sunday evening, only some 8 hours after Kennedy had given "the go-ahead." In the first dark, the expedition was even then creeping toward the Cuban shore. In Bissell's office there was a call on the White House line. It was Bundy, being even crisper than usual: the B-26's were to stand down, there was to be no air strike in the morning, this was a Presidential order. Secretary of State Rusk was now acting for the President in the situation. If Bissell wished to make a "reclama" (federalese for appeal), it could be done through Rusk.

Bissell was stunned. In Allen Dulles' absence (he was in Puerto Rico), he put his problem up to CIA Deputy Director Charles Cabell, an experienced airman. Together they went to the State Department to urge Rusk to reconsider a decision that, in their judgment, would put the enterprise in irretrievable peril. Cabell was greatly worried about the vulnerability to air attack first of the ships and then of the troops on the beach. Rusk was not impressed. The ships, he suggested, could unload and retire to the open sea before daylight; as for the troops ashore being unduly inconvenienced by Castro's air, it had been his experience as a colonel in the Burma theater, he told the visitors, that air attack could be more of a nuisance than a danger. One fact he made absolutely clear: military considerations had overruled the political when the D-minus-2 strike had been laid on; now political considerations were taking over. While they were talking, Rusk telephoned the President at Glen Ora to say that Cabell and Bissell were at his side, and that they were worried about the cancellation of the strike. Rusk, at one point, put his hand over the mouthpiece, and asked Cabell whether he wished to speak to the President. Cabell shook his head. Perhaps that was his mistake; it was certainly his last chance to appeal to a lamentable decision. But Bundy had made it clear that Rusk was acting for the President, and Cabell is a professional military man, trained to take orders after the facts had been argued with the man in command.

On their return to the office, Bissell flashed orders to the B-26 commander at the staging field, more than 500 miles from the Bay of Pigs. The force got the changed orders shortly before midnight, only half an hour or so before they were scheduled to depart; the bomb bays were already loaded and the crews were aboard. Meanwhile the planes carrying the paratroopers had taken off, and the first assault barges, still unobserved, were even then approaching the beaches.

TUESDAY, THE TURNING POINT

Past midnight, in the early watches, Bissell and Cabell restudied the battle plan, while signals of consternation welled up from their men far to the south. At 4 o'clock, less than an hour before first light on the Cuban shore, Cabell went back to Rusk with another proposal. It was manifestly impossible for the brigade's small force of B-26's (only 16 were operational) to provide effective air cover for the ships from their distant base against jets that could reach the ships in minutes. Cabell now asked whether, if the ships were to pull back of the 3- or 12-mile limit—whichever distance U.S. legal doctrine held to be the beginnings of international water—the U.S.S. *Boxer*, a carrier on station about 50 miles from the Bay of Pigs, could be instructed to provide cover for them. Rusk said no and this time Cabell finally took advantage of the reclama that Bundy had extended to Bissell. The President was awakened. Cabell registered his concern. The answer still was no.

Shortly after that, on Monday morning, April 17, Brig. Gen. Chester Clifton, the President's military aide received word that the Cuban Brigade had landed. They had little chance. They were without the ranging fire power that the B-26's with their bombs and machineguns had been expected to apply against Castro's tanks and artillery as they wheeled up. Castro's forces came up fast. He still had four jets left, and they were indeed armed with powerful rockets. He used them well against the ships in the bay. Before the morning was done, he had sunk two transports, aboard which was the larger part of the reserve stocks of ammunition, and driven off two others, with the rest of the stock.

Now Kennedy and his strategists became alarmed. About noon on Monday, Bissell was told that the B-26's could attack Castro's airfields at will. Orders went to the staging base for a major attack next morning. But the orders came too late. Most of the pilots had been in the air for upwards of 18 hours in an unavailing effort to keep Castro's planes off the troops and the remaining ships. That night a small force was scratched together. It was over Cuba at dawn, only to find the fields hidden by low, impenetrable fog. Nothing came of the try.

Tuesday, the second day, was the turning point. The men ashore had fought bravely and gained their planned objectives. They had even seized and bulldozed the airfield. But they were desperately short of ammunition and food, and under the pressure of Castro's superior firepower and numbers they were being forced back across the beach; three B-26's trying to help them were shot down.

Two small landing craft had made rendezvous with two remaining supply ships and taken on ammunition and rations; but from where they were, they could not reach the beach until after daybreak, at which time Castro's jets were certain to get them. There remained still one last clear chance to make the thing go. *Boxer* was still on station. The release of a few of its jets simply for air cover should see the two craft safely to the shore.

"DEFEAT IS AN ORPHAN"

That night Kennedy was caught up in a White House reception, a white-tie affair, for Congress and the members of his Cabinet. He was informed by an aide that Bissell wished to see him. The President asked Bissell to come to the White House. Calls went out to the other principals—to Rusk, who had been entertaining the Greek Premier at a formal dinner at the State Department, to McNamara, General Lemnitzer, Admiral Burke.

They gathered in the President's office shortly after midnight. One of the participants recalls: "Two men dominated that singular occasion—the President and Bissell. Bissell was in the unhappy posture of having to present the views of an establishment that had been overtaken by disaster. He did so with control, with dignity, and with clarity." Bissell made it plain that the expedition was at the point of no return; unless U.S. airpower was brought forward, the men on the beach were doomed. In substance, he asked that the *Boxer*'s planes be brought into the battle to save the operation. Rusk still would not have this. Several others were also opposed, including the President's personal staffers. Burke vouched for the worth of Bissell's proposition. The discussion with the President lasted until 2 a.m. Its outcome was a singular compromise. Jets from the *Boxer* would provide cover next morning for exactly 1 hour—from 6:30 to 7:30 a.m., just long enough for the ships to run into the shore and start unloading, and for the remaining B-26's to get in a hard blow.

Next morning, through an incredible mischance, the B-26's were over Cuba half an

hour ahead of schedule. *Boxer*'s jets were still on the flight deck. But Castro's jets were ready. Two of the B-26's were shot down; others were hit and forced to abort. That was the melancholy end. At two-thirty that afternoon, Bissell received word from one of his men aboard a ship in the Bay of Pigs: remnants of the landing force were in the water and under fire. There was a final message from the gallant brigade commander ashore to this effect, "I have nothing left to fight with and so cannot wait. Am headed for the swamp." Bissell went to the White House to report the end. Kennedy gave orders for a destroyer to move into the bay and pick up as many men as it could. It was no Dunkirk. Only a few men of the 1,400 were saved.

"Victory," Kennedy noted some days later, "has a hundred fathers, and defeat is an orphan." Yet, for all Kennedy's outward calmness at this moment of defeat, he was never, after it, quite the same. Speaking before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, a grave President said, "There are from this sobering episode useful lessons for all to learn."

Adm. DeWitt Clinton Ramsey: Naval Officer, Aviation Pioneer, Industrialist, and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, now that more than 15 years have passed since the end of World War II, the memory of that momentous struggle, which is passing rapidly from the public mind, is being momentarily recalled with increasing frequency through the obituary notices of important war leaders.

The latest such story was that about Adm. DeWitt Clinton Ramsey, who as Naval Aviator No. 45, was a pioneer in the development of the modern Navy, and rose, after a distinguished career to the high and responsible positions of Vice Chief of Naval Operations, 1946-47, and commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, 1948-49. It was my privilege to have known this eminent naval officer.

Though the obituary accounts of his services list many of his important assignments, there is one highly significant contribution to contemporary U.S. history made under his direction, which is known only to those who have delved deeply into interoceanic canal questions, which I have attempted to do.

The tour of Admiral Ramsey as Vice Chief of Naval Operations coincided with the 1946-47 drive for a sea level canal at Panama, which grew out of the hysteria following the advent of the atomic bomb. To aid those conducting the studies for the modernization of the Panama Canal authorized under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, with respect to navigational planning, Admiral Ramsey was a leader in setting up in the Navy Department what is known as the Panama Canal Liaison Organization. An experienced navigator, who had made many transits

of the Panama Canal, and a student of its problems of operation, he strenuously opposed the idea of a canal at sea level as being justified on the alleged basis of hypothetical security and always urged the best operational canal practicable of economic achievement by means of what has become known as the Terminal Lake-Third Locks Plan. Also, it should be recorded that when the 1946-47 Naval Isthmian Canal studies were underway, Admiral Ramsey kept in close touch with the leaders in the Congress and high officials of other Government agencies concerned with the canal question, authorizing on various occasions full presentations on the operational aspects of the canal problem.

In order that a suitable record of Admiral Ramsey's distinguished career, as well as his experienced judgment on the Panama Canal modernization question may be suitably recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, I quote the following obituary notice as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1961]

DEWITT CLINTON RAMSEY DEAD; ADMIRAL LED U.S. PACIFIC FLEET—VETERAN OF 37 YEARS RETIRED IN 1949—AVIATION OFFICER COMMANDED THE "SARATOGA"

PHILADELPHIA, September 7.—Adm. DeWitt Clinton Ramsey, former commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet, died today in the Philadelphia Naval Hospital at the age of 72.

At his retirement in 1949 he also was High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Admiral Ramsey lived in Washington. He leaves his wife, the former Juanita Holmes of Louisville, Ky.

WAS AVIATOR NO. 45

Admiral Ramsey was an air-minded officer during his nearly 40 years of naval service.

He was born in Whipple Barracks in Arizona where his father, an Army captain, was stationed. He graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1912.

As a midshipman, he ranked high scholastically and won letters in track, baseball, basketball, and football. Soon after being commissioned in 1912 he turned to flying. One of the pioneer aviation officers at the Pensacola Training Station in Florida, he was designated aviator No. 45 in 1947.

During World War I, the future admiral saw duty in France and England in naval aviation, followed by three tours of duty as fleet aviation officer on the staff of commanders in chief of the fleet.

After the second tour he was assigned for 3 years as commanding officer of the training squadron at the Naval Academy. In 1924 he was back in Pensacola, as superintendent of flight training.

He was navigator of the aircraft carrier *Langley* from 1926 to 1928 and later executive officer of the *Wright* and of the carrier *Saratoga*.

Admiral Ramsey completed the senior course at the Naval War College in 1937. He became head of the Plans Division of the Bureau of Aeronautics, and later assistant chief of the bureau during the buildup of American power before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Early in World War II, Admiral Ramsey was commanding officer of the *Saratoga*, which took part in the battles of Coral Sea and Midway and in the first offensive against the Solomon Islands in August 1942.

As a rear admiral, he was Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics from 1943 to 1945, in charge of aircraft design and production. He was then made Chief of Staff of the 5th Fleet, serving under Adm. Raymond A. Spruance until November 1945.

Admiral Ramsey next was deputy commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean areas until January 1946, and Vice Chief of Naval Operations for the next 2 years. He then filled his final assignment as commander of the Pacific Fleet.

Among his citations and decorations were the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with Gold Star and the Mexican Service Medal. He was also honorary member of the Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences.

Upon his retirement, Admiral Ramsey was elected president of the Aircraft Industries Association of America, composed of top executives of leading manufacturers of aircraft. He served in this post until 1957. Later he became vice chairman of the association's board of governors.

Berlin Crisis and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include No. 188 in a series of editorials prepared and delivered by Jesse Helms of Raleigh, N.C., expressing the viewpoint of television station WRAL-TV on current issues. This particular editorial is of significance today in view of the current crisis over Berlin. The editorial recalls some recent history which should not be forgotten by those who believe that the free-enterprise system offers the best hope for economic growth. I commend it to my colleagues in the Congress and to all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

This may sound a bit strange, coming from us, but if anybody wants to suggest that free enterprise was at least one of the causes of the current Berlin crisis, we will simply nod in agreement.

What's more, we confess the hope that free enterprise will continue to cause anguish in the Communist camp, just as it has done in Berlin.

It all began 10 years ago, when the West German Government decided to stop taking economic advice from the United States. Instead, the West Germans installed an absolute free enterprise system, in complete disregard for the advice given by so-called economic experts from this country.

As a result, business began to boom in West Germany; it wasn't long before there were more jobs than there were workers; production went up; salaries increased. West Germany enjoyed a boom such as it had never seen before.

Meanwhile, the people of East Berlin continued to struggle along under the controls and restrictions of the socialist regime, controlled by Russia. While the people in West Germany rapidly improved their standard of living—with complete freedom, to boot—the people of East Berlin stood virtually still in their misery.

It wasn't long, of course, before the people in East Berlin saw the light, and began slipping into West Berlin.

Day by day, week by week, month by month, the movement continued, until the Communists in East Berlin were in trouble. A shortage of skilled labor became apparent. Finally it reached the crisis stage. Then was when Khrushchev began to string the barbed wire. He had to use force to stop the flow of humanity into West Berlin.

The Berlin crisis, almost everyone is now agreed, holds little likelihood of war. This Nation has shown its intentions to stand up for the position of the free world. Mr. Khrushchev's bluff has been called.

So, Berlin stands as the modern world's best example of the difference between liberty and virtual slavery, between the free enterprise system and the socialist system of government, operating in East Berlin under the sponsorship of Moscow.

But if we are to benefit from the comparison, or the contrast, we must first understand it ourselves. Ten years ago, this Nation sent a team of economic experts to West Germany to insist that the same sort of governmental system now in operation in East Germany be adopted.

The chairman of that team of experts was Alvin H. Hansen, a professor of economics at Harvard, who had earlier proclaimed that the American Government could preserve its economy only by massive programs of taxation and spending. He offered the same advice to Germany. A top member of that team was Dr. Walter W. Heller, whom President Kennedy recently appointed as Chairman of his own Council of Economic Advisers.

But in 1951, West Germany's Economic Minister Ludwig Erhard was in no mood to continue to accept the sort of advice his government was getting from the United States. He threatened to resign, if he were forced to accept the advice. Therefore, West Germany turned its back on the advice from the United States, and moved forward on a free enterprise program of sound currency, balanced budgets, elimination of government controls, reduction of taxes, and encouragement of private business.

This was one of the most dramatic and successful governmental decisions in history. The story of how Germany emerged from the ruins and ashes of World War II to become the strongest nation in Western Europe is more than a tribute to the initiative and hard work of the people of West Germany; it is all the evidence that any thinking person should need to understand the importance and the potential of the free enterprise system.

But there is an irony in the situation. America, which has economic problems of every description, seems intent upon ignoring what has happened in Germany. Indeed, our President's top economic strategist, Dr. Heller, is the same man whose 1951 policies were repudiated by the West German Government.

It is to be hoped that President Kennedy will grasp the real significance of the Berlin crisis, for West Germany has shown the world not only that it is possible to be free—but that it pays to be free.

Review of Claims in the VA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out in my remarks previously, in the RECORDS of September 13 and 18, 1961, page A7197 and A7398, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has found the study performed by the law students on VA claims most helpful.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks one individual case in three separate columns to indicate the subject matter involved.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

STATE SERVICE OFFICE,
ST. PETERSBURG VA REGIONAL OFFICE,
February 9, 1961.

Memorandum to Adjudication Division.

As the veteran's accredited representative we are in agreement, in the main, with the facts as stated in the case for appellate review.

We feel, however, that insufficient consideration has been given to the microscopic report of the eye, dated July 31, 1945, which shows chronic keratitis, chronic uveitis, calcified cataract, detachment gliosis and calcification of retina; intraocular hemorrhage; ossification of choroid; phthisis bulbi, and the probability of existent infection to the eye, which should concede to aggravation.

A. W. KRUEGER,
Assistant State Service Officer.

STATEMENT OF CASE FOR APPELLATE REVIEW
ISSUE

1. Restoration of service connection for blindness and removal of left eye.

MILITARY MEDICAL RECORDS

December 18, 1942: Entrance examination vision left eye nil, degenerated left eye.

April 9 to 15, 1943: HR tonsillitis acute follicular bilateral.

October 8 to 11, 1943: H febricula mild.

November 5, 1943: Routine classification examination left eye blind; phthisis bulbi, left.

May 19 to June 21, 1945: HR, phthisis bulbi, left, result of old injury incurred when cap exploded and struck in eye. Examination shows gradual change in appearance of iris and gradual recession of eyeball; enucleation done May 24, 1945. Transferred to McGuire General Hospital June 21, 1945.

June 21 to July 9, 1945: HR ophthalmos-teris left eye.

July 29, 1945: Discharge examination enucleation O.S. left eye had been injured prior to entering service. Began to give more distress in Iran, therefore it was removed. Form 53-55 discharge shows veteran served EAM ETO leaving United States June 5, 1943, arrival August 26, 1943; departure February 1, 1945, arrival United States, March 12, 1945.

July 31, 1945: Microscopic report of eye shows chronic keratitis, chronic uveitis, calcified cataract, detachment gliosis and calcification of retina; intraocular hemorrhage; ossification of choroid; phthisis bulbi.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL RECORDS

July 29 1959: VA examination shows enucleation left eye, healthy socket. History of mucous discharge from left eye which clears up in a few days. Anophthalmos left vision right 20/40.

ADJUDICATION ACTIONS

September 17, 1945: Rating by Regional Board No. 4, St. Petersburg, granted service connection with evaluation of 10 percent for residuals of removal left eye with entitlement to statutory award on account of anatomical loss of one eye from July 30, 1945. Rating indicated blindness left on entering service. Began to give distress in Iran and therefore it was removed. Service connection established by aggravation for removal of left eye.

October 10, 1946: Rating by Regional Board No. 2, Miami, Fla., reviewed case under paragraph 9, Public 182-79C and the 1945 Statute. Confirmed and continued prior rating.

August 2, 1948: Rating by Regional Board No. 2, Miami, Fla., additional clinical records received and rating of October 10, 1946, was confirmed and continued.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDING OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS,

April 7, 1961.

Appellant represented by: Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

THE ISSUE

The appeal was timely filed, and is properly before the Board, from the rating action of the regional office at St. Petersburg, Fla., which severed service connection for residuals of removal of left eye. It is contended that the heat and/or sand in Iran aggravated the left eye and necessitated its removal. It is also contended that microscopic report on the eye indicates an active disease of the eye during service.

THE EVIDENCE

(The veteran) served from December 1942 to July 1945. He was overseas approximately 21 months and departed for the United States in early February 1945. Degeneration and complete loss of vision of the left eye were noted at induction. Left phthisis bulbi was reported in November 1943, when the veteran was examined for reclassification. He was seen at the dispensary in May 1945, and it was reported he had sustained an injury to the left eye at age 7; phthisis bulbi and a band-shaped keratitis were noted; X-ray revealed calcific densities of the left eyeball. During hospitalization later in the same month, it was reported for clinical purposes that since the eye injury there had been a gradual change in the appearance of the iris and recession of the eyeball. Reference was not made to any complaint or symptom of an infectious process or injury of the eye during service. The left eye was enucleated and microscopic examination revealed "chronic keratitis; chronic uveitis; calcified cataract; detachment, gliosis, and calcification of retina; intraocular hemorrhage; ossification of choroid; phthisis bulbi." At time of discharge from service, the veteran stated that his eye started bothering him in Iran.

A claim for compensation was submitted at time of separation from service. When examined in July 1959 (the veteran) stated that occasionally there was a mucous discharge from the left socket, which cleared within a few days. On examination, the socket appeared healthy.

Service connection was granted for residuals of removal of the left eye, but on later review such action was held to be clearly and unmistakably in error and service connection was discontinued.

THE LAW AND REGULATIONS

Service connection is warranted for disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty during active service (38 U.S.C. 310).

38 CFR 3.306 specifies that the usual effects of surgical intervention for correction of a preexisting disability, including a poorly functioning organ, will not be considered to be service connected unless the disability was otherwise aggravated during service. It also specifies that, in determining aggravation, due regard will be given to the places, types, and circumstances of service, with particular consideration being given to combat duty and other hardships of service.

38 CFR 3.105 provides that service connection once granted, may not be severed except on the basis of clear and unmistakable error.

DISCUSSION AND EVALUATION

Degeneration and complete blindness of the eye were noted at induction. The service records contain no reference to the occurrence of any eye disease or injury during service. The phthisis bulbi reported in November 1943 represents a descriptive variation of degeneration noted at induction. The intraocular hemorrhage reported on

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

ISSUE

Restoration of service connection for blindness and removal of left eye.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

September 14, 1959: Rating with jurisdiction review DA letter December 14, 1954, under proposal to sever service connection under VAR 1105(D) for residuals removal of left eye and for statutory award for anatomical loss of left eye. It was held that there was no evidence of superimposed disease, trauma, or other condition referable to eyes in service and that aggravation was not shown and held that in accordance with old VAR 1063 I service connection was not in order.

June 29, 1960: Administrative review by Director, Compensation and Pension Service, concurred in proposal to sever service connection for residuals for removal of left eye and entitlement to special monthly pension on account of anatomical loss of only one eye.

July 11, 1960: Letter to veteran notified of proposal to serve service connection.

September 23, 1960: Rating by regional board No. 4, PAGRO under VAR 11105A denied service connection for absence left eye.

October 17, 1960: Letter to veteran advising that compensation will be discontinued effective November 1, 1960.

November 7, 1960: Communication from veteran's representative for personal hearing.

October 27, 1960: Statement from veteran 8-4138 stating he was blind when he entered service and at that time eye was almost as large as right eye; that when he returned from overseas the eye had deteriorated so he could only open eyelid halfway and that Captain Rosen suggested removing the eye stating the operation was necessary. Said deterioration caused by excessive heat in Iran. He said he objected to the removal but was advised operation was absolutely necessary for his health's sake.

October 27, 1960: Veteran's representative, VFW, submitted 1-9 appeal, stating that most of veteran's overseas service was in desert country with deterioration of same and requests reinstatement of service connection by aggravation. Hearing was scheduled for December 13, 1960, but veteran did not report for hearing. Scheduled for January 17, 1961. Form 1-846, statement of accredited representative, sets out the facts in the case requesting thorough consideration be given to the question at issue and statement of veteran submitted with appeal.

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDING OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

microscopic examination was occasioned by the operative procedure; the other findings reported on that examination pertain to chronic conditions resulting from an old injury, and no findings relative to an acute infectious process were reported. The veteran served overseas for approximately 21 months without any pertinent complaint of the eye being reported, other than an examination for reclassification, and did not report to the dispensary for another eye examination until more than 3 months after he departed for return to the United States. In the absence of service trauma or disease, aggravation of an eye disability is determined by the difference in acuity at induction and that existing at discharge, and not by the mere fact that an eye was enucleated during service for some other reason.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Degeneration with complete loss of vision of the left eye existed prior to service.
2. Microscopic examination in service did not reveal evidence of an active or progressive infection, but did disclose residuals of old traumatic and infectious processes.
3. The absence of the left eye demonstrated during service clearly and unmistakably was the usual result of surgery for correction of a preexisting disability.
4. There clearly and unmistakably was, otherwise, no increase or aggravation of the preexisting disability of the left eye during service.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Service connection for residuals of removal of the left eye was clearly and unmistakably in error, within the meaning of 38 CFR 3.105, and may not be restored.

DECISION

The appeal is denied.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

FINDINGS OF FACT

- (1) Induction examination December 18, 1942, revealed claimant veteran was totally blind in the left eye, and that the eye was degenerated.
- (2) During service veteran was stationed in Iran from August 1943, to February 1945. There is some opinion evidence of record tending to show that excessive heat in the desert area in which veteran was stationed caused further deterioration of the eye.
- (3) Examination May 19, 1945, revealed a gradual change in appearance of the iris and gradual recession of the eyeball. The eye was enucleated May 24, 1945.
- (4) Discharge examination July 29, 31, 1945, showed chronic keratitis, chronic uveitis, calcified cataract, detachment gliosis and calcification of retina; intraocular hemorrhage; ossification of choroid; phthisis bulbi. There is no showing that these conditions are normally incident to a degenerated eye or to enucleation.
- (5) Service connection was granted September 17, 1945, with evaluation of 10 percent for residuals of removal of left eye, with entitlement to statutory award on account of anatomical loss of one eye.
- (6) VA examination July 29, 1959, revealed enucleation of the left eye, healthy socket. Veteran gave a history of mucous discharge from the left eye which clears up in a few days.
- (7) Service connection was severed September 23, 1960. The reason is not specified.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- (1) Veteran's claim is governed by the provisions for wartime disability compensation (38 U.S.C. 101(8), 310).
- (2) Since total blindness of the left eye was noted at the time of the induction examination there can be no question of service connection with blindness of that eye, either on a presumptive or factual basis (38 U.S.C. 311). It was manifestly erroneous to grant service connection for purposes of the statutory award for blindness of one eye, since the statute, with respect to loss of one eye, refers only to blindness and not to anatomical loss (38 U.S.C. 314(k)). Any other interpretation of this statute would require that it be read so as to refer to "anatomical loss or loss of use of . . . blindness." Since it is absolutely clear from the record that blindness itself did not result from any service connected disability and that blindness of the eye was not itself such a service connected disability, the only question of service connection relates to that disability arising from residual effects of enucleation.

STATEMENT OF FACTS PREPARED BY THE REGIONAL OFFICE AND TRANSMITTED TO THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

DECISION, CONTAINING FINDING OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, OF THE BOARD OF VETERANS' APPEALS

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PREPARED BY LAW STUDENT FROM THE STATEMENT OF FACTS WHICH APPEARS IN THE FIRST COLUMN

(3) There is evidence of record indicating that, although the veteran's left eye was degenerated at the time of induction, his service in a desert area caused further deterioration of the eye. In the absence of a specific finding that such further deterioration was due to the normal progress of his condition, this increase in the severity of his disability must be presumed to have been aggravated by service (38 U.S.C. 353; 38 CFR 3.63(1)). It is true that the mere fact of enucleation will not establish aggravation, but since service connection depends in such cases on whether the cause of enucleation was service incurred or aggravated, and since the places of the veteran's service are relevant considerations in determining aggravation, service connection for the cause of enucleation must be conceded even though such service connection for blindness would be erroneous (38 CFR 3.63(1)).

(4) It follows, therefore, that the statutory award for anatomical loss of the left eye was clearly and unmistakably erroneous on these facts, and service connection in this respect was properly severed. But service connection for any residual effects of enucleation itself must be conceded.

Nancy Bean, the Sunshine Girl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, little or no explanation is needed in connection with the editorial I submit to you today from the September 7, 1961, edition of the Sun Advocate, of Price, Utah.

The faith and courage of this 19-year-old heroine, Miss Nancy Bean, is an example that each of us might well emulate.

This resolute young lady has remained undaunted throughout one crisis after another and has borne pain and disappointment these past 10 years in a fashion not unlike the great Joan of Arc.

My hat is off to Price's "Girl of Courage." I hope and pray that her future will reciprocate with some of the sunshine and happiness she has brought to those who have had the privilege of knowing her.

The editorial follows:

A GIRL OF COURAGE

Price's "Girl of Courage," Miss Nancy Bean, has battled her way through another crisis and is recovering at the home of her mother, Mrs. Catherine Bean, at 1139 South 13th East in Salt Lake City, following 2 months at the L.D.S. Hospital.

The courage label was pinned on Nancy long ago, and on various members of her family who have assisted the 19-year-old girl through 10 long years of fighting a battle for health, following paralysis from her waist through her legs after complications which occurred after a sickness with measles.

Nancy's newest experience included treatment before and after the amputation of both legs which will eventually enable her to sit up again in a wheel chair. For nearly 3 years she was confined to her bed, lying on her stomach and the latest operation will

give her more freedom with bodily movement.

Hospital attendants called Nancy "The Sunshine Girl," and her friends locally know that her kind attitude and ready smile could earn that title. Nancy visited other patients to encourage them in their illnesses toward recovery.

Plans for the future include courses at a Salt Lake City high school, a great deal of physical therapy and plenty of determination to become as self-sufficient as possible.

With Nancy and her mother in Salt Lake City is a sister, Miss Annette Bean, who is employed in the city.

Word of Nancy's release from the Salt Lake City hospital was recovered in Price by her grandmother, Mrs. Nettle Sax, who has stood by Nancy through every phase of her long ordeal.

The courage of this youthful girl through her many painful trials and tribulations is a lesson for all of us who sometimes feel the cards are stacked against us just because we suffer setbacks in our business or private lives. Nancy has suffered one setback after another but through it all she has maintained a calm cheerfulness that makes others wonder if they could have withstood the suffering.

Hon. Overton Brooks

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commemorating the memory of that fine gentleman and esteemed friend, OVERTON BROOKS, whose untimely passing we all regret.

Since coming to Congress, I have had the great honor to serve with OVERTON BROOKS on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. It was here I had an opportunity to observe Mr.

BROOKS as a friend, as a Member of Congress, and as a leader of men. In addition to being dedicated to the best interests of the citizens of his district—his first allegiance—he was the first chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee and perhaps the one person most responsible for alerting the Nation and working for a truly effective national space effort.

The people of this country shall be forever indebted to him for the outstanding service he rendered to his Nation. His contribution shall live long after all of us have passed to our eternal reward. And it shall stand as a living monument to OVERTON BROOKS, the man, the friend, and the tireless patriot.

I wish to extend my profound and most heartfelt sympathy to his family on their great loss. His untimely passing will leave a void that will be felt in their home and in the House of Representatives for many years to come.

Business Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Hon. John E. Horne, recently issued a semiannual report covering SBA's operations for the first 6 months of 1961. This report outlines the increasing role SBA is playing in the economic life of the Nation.

But one section in Mr. Horne's report is alarming. The figures given in that section make possible an opportunity to compare the state of the economy in the small business sector during the first

6 months of 1961 with the similar period in 1960. The following excerpts from the report are quoted in order to show this comparison:

BUSINESS INCORPORATIONS

Figures on business incorporations also provide a measure of small business growth, since about half of all new, and primarily small businesses, choose the corporate form of organization.

According to Dun & Bradstreet, Inc., business incorporations were 5 percent lower in the first 5 months of this year than in the same period of 1960. This year, there were 77,600 incorporations; in 1960, there were 81,441.

BUSINESS FAILURES

Business failures, which also relate primarily to small concerns, have continued at a high level. Through the week ended July 13, Dun & Bradstreet reported 9,568 failures this year, compared with 8,356 in the same period of 1960. If failures were to continue at this same rate throughout the remainder of the year, the total would be nearly 18,000. In view of the recent business upturn, this high a total seems unlikely. Nevertheless, the number apparently will be greater than in other year since the end of World War II.

An Arms Control Agency Should Not Be Established at This Critical Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate on this bill to establish an Arms Control Agency with concern and deep misgivings as to its real purpose and benefit to our country and to our allies.

The bill proposes that an agency be established with no definite authority or actual responsibility, but to act only in an advisory capacity under the jurisdiction of the President and the Secretary of State.

Arms control for whom? For the United States of America only and for no other nation on earth, including Russia of course.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that the U.S. Congress does not and cannot legislate for any other nation on earth, friend or enemy.

True, every nation on earth is willing to accept our dollars by the billion and with few strings attached, but they will control their own armed might, weak or strong, whether we like it or not, which has been proven time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be a party to passing a bill such as this to place another agency between our able, experienced military experts and the President of the United States, present or future. The last April Cuban fiasco should have cured us of delegating additional war or peace recommendations to the State Department, which this bill does in just so many words.

We have the United Nations organization, with headquarters in New York

City. That organization was established primarily to keep the world at peace. Russia is a member of the United Nations, and was in 1951. But that did not stop her from marching on Korea. Is anyone naive enough to believe that they will now follow suit if we pass this bill and that they will make any attempt to control their armed might and even if they agree to do so, why of course they will not, but to the contrary. The Communists will build stronger their armed might, while word will go out to our Western Allies that the United States is actually preparing to reduced its armed might by establishing this so-called Arms Control Agency, and so again, we lose prestige around the world at this critical hour when we should be showing the kind of firmness the American people expect.

Prayer for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in these times when the hearts of men are filled with the hope and prayer for peace, it is fitting and proper that we invoke the divine guidance and the help of the Prince of Peace. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I have secured the permission of the House to include in the RECORD the following prayer for peace, a prayer of the Crusade of Prayer for Peace to be conducted on September 17 to October 29, 1961, under the auspices of the Archdiocese of Washington, with the closing exercises to be held on the Washington Monument grounds on Sunday, October 29, 1961:

PRAYER FOR PEACE

O Divine Savior, who has given us the perfect example of wisdom and simplicity, grant us the wisdom to recognize injustice and untruth in our world today.

We beseech Thee, O Compassionate Redeemer, to give in our time that peace based on justice which the human race has ever sought. Grant consolation to the peoples who groan under the yoke of godless oppressors, and hear their cry for deliverance. Pour forth Thy grace into the hearts of all people, who earnestly and sincerely desire peace, that they may embrace Thy truth and spread its prevailing influence over their lands.

We pray especially for our President, that his inspired leadership may give hope to a world threatened daily by war and that the heavy burden of responsibility in these critical days, may not rest too heavily on his shoulders.

We pray for the members of the Cabinet, the Members of Congress and for all who are entrusted with the burden of Government in these days, that they may seek above every other consideration peace with justice in our own country and in every nation.

We earnestly beg Thee, O Prince of Peace, to hasten the coming of that day when all nations will live in harmony under Thy law, and every human being will worship Thee in freedom. These great favors we humbly ask, trusting in Thy goodness, and uniting with those millions who even now courageously

suffer for love of Thee and who fervently yearn for the coming of Thy reign of peace. Amen.

Recognition of the Republic of Outer Mongolia Will Outrage Public Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 87th Congress is rapidly drawing to a close and I view the coming adjournment with mixed emotions. Like most of my colleagues, I am anxious to return to my home district and State, but if certain events, as prophesied, come to pass during adjournment, I for one, will sincerely regret the final fall of the gavel.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the persistent rumor that the State Department is only awaiting adjournment to put in motion a plan involving diplomatic recognition of the Republic of Outer Mongolia. Recognition of this Russian satellite is of course only a prelude to Outer Mongolian membership in the United Nations.

I understand that Owen Lattimore, whose advice was so helpful to the success of the Communist takeover in China, and who recently returned from an extended visit to Outer Mongolia, has informally reported on his findings to high sources in the Department of State. In this connection, I believe it only fair to assume he has also made informal recommendations.

Remembering that Mr. Lattimore officially recommended in the strongest possible terms recognition of this Communist country only a few short years ago, it is not hard to imagine the nature of his present views on this subject. At that time, he stated that as in the case of the Communist Chinese, the political leaders of these people were actually agrarian reformers and patriots, and in view of the revolutionary beginnings of this country, deserved U.S. understanding and sympathy.

The argument advanced by the Department of State, that we need this listening post in the middle of the Gobi Desert, falls on deaf ears as far as I am concerned. Rather, I would regard diplomatic recognition of Outer Mongolia as another in a long list of appeasement gestures to an ideology which regards these gestures merely as signs of weakness and is in no way placated by them.

International communism will of course accept every concession the United States is willing to make; concessions, incidentally, which are one-sided. The Communist conspiracy, like the monster it is, has an insatiable appetite for these "giveaways" and its strength is increasingly augmented by every fresh compromise at the conference table.

In the name of commonsense, I urge the State Department architects of this

nefarious plan to reconsider, bearing in mind that those responsible will be held to a strict accounting by an aroused public as well as many Members of Congress, who, like myself, will deeply resent any under-the-table dealings such as this during the coming adjournment.

The Meaning and Purposes of Farmer Cooperatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa sponsored a speech contest. Miss Ann Lage, a senior at North Scott High School, Eldridge, Iowa, won the top award with her entry entitled "The Meaning and Purposes of Farmer Cooperatives." Because she has done such a good job with this subject and because I think there is some valuable information here that all Members of Congress should know about, I wish to have a copy of her speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE MEANING AND PURPOSES OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

Small children, especially 5-year olds, often have strange conceptions of institutions in the adult world. I can still remember when, as a small girl of 5, I made my first trip to Eldridge. Arriving in Eldridge I became very excited, for before me rose what, to my small eyes, resembled a giant milk carton. Impatiently I tugged at my father to tell me what that was. In the casual manner adults have with children, he replied, "Oh, that's the Co-op."

"Co-op, that's a funny word," I puzzled. But it did sound important, and I was so proud of seeing it that the first thing I did when I got home was to tell my mother that I had seen a co-op. For many months after that, every tall building I saw was a co-op.

Of course that oversized milk carton I had seen was our local cooperative elevator. However, in seeing the elevator, had I really seen the co-op? Is the elevator itself the cooperative? Behind the elevator are aims and purposes that make it more than just another place of business and different from the corporation.

In most business corporations the operation of the plant for profit, is the sole purpose of the business. However, in a cooperative the plant is just the instrument used by the cooperative to carry on its aims and purposes. Cooperatives can be distinguished from privately owned enterprise by this and other features.

The first successful consumer cooperative was started in Rochdale, England, in 1844, by a group of 28 poor weavers who saved \$140 for the purpose in establishing their store they adopted certain basic principles, today called the Rochdale principles. Their ideas proved so successful that they have served as a guide for cooperatives ever since. These principles are:

1. Anyone may join.
2. Each member has only one vote regardless how many shares he owns. In private companies, owners vote according to the amount of stock they hold. In cooperatives all members have an equal voice.

3. Goods and services are sold at the going market prices. This makes for fair competition with private business.

4. When all expenses are paid, the profits are returned to the members in proportion to their patronage in the form of patronage refunds or dividends.

To clearly understand the meaning and purposes of cooperatives we must first understand these basic principles.

There are many types of cooperative organizations that use these principles. When people join together to buy goods for their own use, they form consumers' cooperatives. When farmers unite to sell what they raise, they have a marketing cooperative. If they unite to buy needed farm supplies such as feed, seed, and fertilizer, they have a purchasing cooperative.

Although each one of these cooperatives has its specific purpose, there are basic purposes that apply to all cooperatives. Their basic purpose is to jointly carry out certain of the members business activities so the members can operate their own businesses more effectively.

A further purpose is to enable the members to provide for themselves, at their own expense and risk, certain goods and services essential to conducting their own private business. Many of these essential services are ordinarily provided by "middle men" or dealers. Naturally these people are interested making a personal profit from the service they render.

Cooperatives enable the members to provide the services for themselves, under their own control. The additional expenses that usually go to the middleman as his profit, now becomes the profit of the cooperative. At the end of the year these profits are returned to the farmer in proportion to his patronage of the cooperative. Doing this enables the member to carry on his own business with more profit.

This brings out another of the main objectives of cooperatives. Their purpose is not to operate a business firm for profit to itself, but to operate a firm that will reduce the expenses or increase the net income of its members.

In defining the purposes of cooperatives, they can in some respects, be compared to the United Nations. The United Nations is an association of countries united for a common purpose—world peace. The countries join voluntarily and retain their sovereignty. The United Nations hold on its members and they are free to withdraw at any time. The purpose of the United Nations was not to take over control of countries, but to help them have a fair advantage in world affairs.

Like the United Nations, cooperatives are also associations of sovereign members, united for a common purpose. In this instance the purpose is to strengthen the economic position of the members. Like the United Nations, cooperatives do not take over control of their members' private business, for the purpose of cooperatives again, is not to operate a new business solely for profit, but to give members larger returns from their present business through the patronage of the cooperative.

In our fast moving modern economy of big business and industry, the lone farmer is caught between the rising cost of operation and the lowering of farm prices. The individual farmer is a small unit when compared with the powers of big business. Alone against such forces he is unable to improve his situation, for he lacks their strength and bargaining power. His earnest plea for his fair share of the consumer's dollar goes unheard.

Aesop said, "Unity gives strength." One other purpose of cooperatives is to unite farmers in their common cause and give them the strength needed to gain their de-

served higher place on America's economic scale. By united action through coops, farmers gain the advantage of collective bargaining and their demands are given strength.

"United we stand—divided we fall." When John Dickenson wrote that phrase in the "Liberty Song" in 1768, he meant it in relation to the thirteen colonies and their struggle with Britain for freedom. Today that same phrase may well be applied to the American farmer and his struggle for existence. As I have said, alone the individual farmer has very little power and will inevitably fall. However, when firmly united in cooperatives, following the purposes I have outlined, they gain the strength to withstand the forces pushing them out of business.

The purposes of cooperatives are manifold, and they all serve to give the members a united stand in increasing the gains from their individual businesses.

Commendation to Ellis J. Pickett and St. George Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of St. George, Utah, recently celebrated a very successful centennial under the expert guidance of General Chairman Ellis J. Pickett and his most efficient committee comprising A. K. Hafen, A. Karl Larson, H. L. Reid, Neida Hutchings, Vernon Worthen, Mary Phoenix, and Charles M. Pickett.

This distinguished group—at great personal sacrifice and effort—planned and prepared a celebration that will always be cherished by the people of St. George and the throngs of former residents and visitors who returned to see and visit friends and loved ones. Mr. Pickett and his committee deserve only the highest commendation and I ask you to join with me in paying tribute to them.

It was impossible for me to mention each and every person who contributed to the establishment and progress of St. George in my original remarks before the House on August 28, 1961. To be sure, many of the people who were the very backbone of the community are unsung heroes—history has failed to record their valuable presentations of public service.

One such frontiersman was Brigham Jarvis who was associated with the history of irrigation from the time he reached St. George in 1861 and found a deep swamp between the south end of the east black ridge and the Virgin River. Later he developed this swamp into a farm and rolled down the rushes and washed in sand with the water from the Virgin Ditch, preparing the way for the road and doing away with a breeding place for mosquitoes.

Brigham Jarvis, the promoter of the project known as Jarvis Ditch, was an untiring worker in the various irrigation

projects of that area. Under his administration as a councilman, history records, work was begun and completed on Cottonwood Ditch. He and the mayor were named to select a route from the gulch to the city. By the end of his term as councilman, the work was completed and the water entering the valley over the red hill to the north. This provided a water supply for the establishment of a city water system later; a system equaled by few and surpassed by none.

To the fathers of St. George—past and present—I rise in respectful appreciation and commendation.

Understanding More Important Than Popularity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article written by Ralph W. Loew which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Buffalo, N.Y., on September 18, 1961, entitled "Understanding More Important Than Popularity."

I wholeheartedly subscribe to Mr. Loew's theory that people today are too much concerned with being popular rather than understanding the basic mission of mankind. He gives us much food for thought in his article which follows:

UNDERSTANDING MORE IMPORTANT THAN POPULARITY

(By Ralph W. Loew)

TRAPPED

Have we been trapped by our desire to be liked? We Americans especially demonstrate this trait, as though we were insecure and needed to satisfy our hunger for applause. Our public relations experts develop methods by which our laudable qualities can be properly cataloged and praised. Newcomers to our country are eagerly asked how they like us, and we await the compliments as though we were little children yearning for praise.

Foreign aid too frequently is debated on the basis of how many friends such assistance will bring to us instead of carefully examining the needs to be met. We want to be understood.

In this kind of a world crisis it isn't necessary to be understood. It is necessary to understand.

DO WE UNDERSTAND?

Think of the tawdry confessions of naive embezzlers, listen to the poignant stories of young people involved in gambling episodes, hear the explanations of the deeds of youthful rioters or their elders who do nothing and in almost every instance there will be a haunting question. "You do understand, don't you?"

In the current nuclear crisis too many official statesmen have been justifying the resumption of the testing on the ground that this necessity has been forced. So the Communists say in effect, "If you understand us as people of peace you would understand what we are doing." To which a startled and shocked world can only ask, "Do any of

us really understand to the full what we are really doing?"

THEY UNDERSTOOD

Now look for a moment at the prophet Amos. He didn't care a fig for popularity. He had a burning message and he was a man with a mission. He stood before the authorities of his day, condemning their rottenness, and pointed them to righteousness.

Or here is John the Baptist. He lived in a time when he saw the rulers winking at morality and defiling all that he knew was the way of righteousness. This he wanted men to understand.

Jesus was able to say with utter candor, "I am not mad. I am honoring My Father and you are trying to dishonor Me. But I am not concerned with My own glory; there is One whose concern it is, and He is the true Judge." There was a fact to be understood; beyond this it wasn't necessary to be understood.

WINNING FRIENDS

Robert Louis Stevenson who knew much about loneliness and kept his personal integrity unsullied could write, "To do anything not because the thing is good or kind or honest in its own right but because others are doing it, is to resign all moral control and captaincy upon yourself and go post haste to the devil with the greatest number."

Perhaps this has been our problem. We've wanted to win friends and influence people. We thought that we could do it by pretense, tricks of the trade, slick-paper advertisements. Sometimes that seems to work. Most of the time it boomerangs. It only tricks ourselves. Then when a man hardly knows who he is, he suddenly feels lonesome, wondering whether anything has been worth while at all.

POPULARITY DRUG

It's nice to be admired. It's fun to be applauded. It's satisfying to be appreciated. It's rough to be criticized. Yet the worst fate of all would be that of throwing away God-given opportunities in the search for truth and a righteous peace, simply because we were absorbed with the narcotic of being popular.

We really aren't in the world to be loved; we are here to love.

We really aren't here to be served; we are here to serve.

We really don't need to be understood; it is utterly important that we understand.

History of Vending in the United States: 75th Anniversary of the Industry— Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the fourth and concluding part of "A Concise History of Vending in the U.S.A.," written by G. R. Schreiber, editor of Vend, the magazine of the vending industry, to commemorate the 75th anniversary of vending in this country, is herewith presented to my colleagues in the House:

A CONCISE HISTORY OF VENDING

Canteen went into candy vending with a nonselective magazine built by Fairchild Manufacturing Co., Kalamazoo, Mich. Later, Canteen contracted with Blue Bird Manufacturing Co., Kansas City, for 4,000 non-

selective candy venders. For a time, Canteen sold only the candy bars then produced by Curtiss Candy Co. But, as Leverone recalled, "people just got tired of eating candy made by the same manufacturer. So we went to Hershey, but Hershey refused to sell us at first because he said he didn't want to get us into financial trouble." Hershey Chocolate Co. had attempted its own vending operation in the 1920's but regarded the business as a failure. Certainly the Hershey-owned Chocolate Vending Co. was losing money when Leverone and Hershey executives talked.

William F. R. Murrel, then president of the Hershey company, was the man who suggested that Leverone build a candy machine which would offer customers a choice of bars. Canteen went to International Register Co. whose chief engineer, Ed Richmond, later vice president of Automatic Canteen Co. of America, designed a five-column machine with a capacity of 60 bars. The selective candy vender set a pattern in the vending industry as well as launched Canteen on its way to a multi-million-dollar vending organization.

During the early 1930's, manufacturers and operating organizations were formed in the Middle West in great numbers: National Relectors was organized in St. Louis to make coin rejectors; National Vendors began production of a nine-selection candy machine; Coan Manufacturing, started in Chicago and later moved to Madison, Wis., built a successful "endless chain" candy vender. In 1931, Automatic Sales Co. of New York installed periodical vending machines in some 75 eastern cities. These were used by Curtis Publishing Co. to vend the Saturday Evening Post and Ladies' Home Journal, but gradually the machines were withdrawn because of mechanical defects and high operating costs.

That same year, 1931, N. Robert Harvey, who had been in the grocery business in Pennsylvania, installed a battery of vending machines in a room of the main floor of the Beaux Arts Apartments in Manhattan. Harvey called his battery the Delamat (delivers automatically), and his idea was to provide the apartment house residents with a 24-hour delicatessen. The insertion of a coin and the turn of a knob started an electric motor which brought the displayed item down to a delivery window by means of a flat tray attached to a conveyor chain. The machines held 30 different items in cans, glass jars, cartons, and paper bags, and included such staples as coffee, sugar, canned vegetables, fruit, and ginger ale, always a big seller in this prohibition period. Harvey installed a vending mechanism in the box of a General Electric refrigerator to vend such foods as butter, eggs, packaged lamb chops, steak, and squab. This was the first attempt to refrigerate and vend foodstuffs. The project failed when Harvey found the operation unprofitable.

One year later, using a general purpose merchandise vender built by the National Sales Machine Co. of St. Louis, another attempt at apartment house vending was undertaken in Los Angeles. This early take-home vending project was the idea of Charles O. Johnson, a distributor for the St. Louis company. Johnson called his venture the Automatic Commissary. The machine he used vended nickel and dime items which were held in tiers in a series of six vertical compartments. The merchandise was protected by a shutter or door which covered the face of each compartment. A glassed section displayed a sample of the item offered in the compartment. When a coin was inserted and the operating handle pulled, the shutter dropped down to expose the compartment in one tier. Johnson's automatic commissary utilized seven of the national units, four stocked with canned goods, one with bakery products, two with

bottled beverages. The automatic commissary included a cigarette and a candy bar vending machine. The automatic commissary failed because it could not provide change, housewives found the 10-cent sizes of grocery items uneconomical, and because the machines were unable to compete with odd-penny pricing in the grocery stores.

While the automatic commissary was a failure, another west coast venture, launched in 1931, successfully opened a new facet of vending. M. T. Zeigler, general manager of the Central Ice & Cold Storage Co., Los Angeles, hit upon the idea of combining two new merchandising trends, packaging and vending, to give new life to his ice business. Zeigler's plan, known as Serv-Ice, had 25-pound cakes of ice sealed in wax-coated manila paper. The ice was trucked to big outdoor vending stations (12 feet high and 8 feet square) where they retailed at 15 cents. The first of these outdoor ice vending stations was installed in Los Angeles in July 1931. By the end of 1932, Zeigler had 24 Serv-Ice machines in operation in Los Angeles and San Diego. Variations of the ice vending device were being built in Maryland, Texas, and by other manufacturers in California including that built by S. & S. Vending Machine Co., San Jose, established in 1932 by two engineers, Leslie Scott and Ernest Smith.

Always a hotbed of invention, California witnessed the first attempt to clean clothes automatically. A machine called the Val-A-Vac was built in San Francisco in 1932. Nickel-operated, it incorporated an electric vacuum which its inventor said would pull the dust and dirt from clothes and hats. It was supposed to be used in restrooms and for service on Pullman cars, but at that time it failed to displace the old-fashioned whisk-broom. Not until the 1960's would coin-operated drycleaning establishments, a sophisticated extension of the Val-A-Vac idea, come into their own.

With the country deep in the throes of the depression in 1934, Chicago's Lincoln Park Zoo was the test site for the first self-contained, cup-type soft drink vending machine. The machine was designed and built by Leslie Arnett, who earlier had many years' experience in the soda fountain field. Arnett also developed the self-contained fountain carbonator which was to revolutionize the manual service of individual cold drinks. After testing and revising his drink machine during the summer of 1934, Arnett placed it permanently for public use in a W. F. Monroe Cigar Store in Chicago during April 1935. In 1936, the group with which Arnett worked formed the Vendrink Co., and so began an entirely new phase of the vending industry. In 1937, the Vendrink machine was taken over by Stewart & McGuire, Inc. When Stewart & McGuire stopped building the unit in 1939, it was taken over by a group headed by C. Russel Feldman, who organized the Frigidrink Corp. in New York. This group had the machine redesigned and built by Brunswick-Balke-Callender Co.

In 1936, J. P. Seeburg Co., Chicago, brought out its Masterdrink, a single-flavor, 200-cup capacity machine similar to the Vendrink. This machine was sold in 1938 to Spacarb, organized that year as a Delaware corporation to operate vending machines on a large scale. In 1937-38, Bally Manufacturing Co., Chicago, produced the first practical premix cup drink vender which dispensed the drinks from tanks already carbonated. Meantime, in 1937, W. W. Bowman of Dallas, Tex., had developed the Frostidrink machine, first as a single flavor machine then as a two-drink vender. Spacarb became interested in the Frostidrink, and in 1939 and 1940 had about 20 three-selection drink venders built. Later, Spacarb acquired Frostidrink, and still later Spacarb was acquired by Rowe

which in turn was acquired by Automatic Canteen.

While the vending companies in the early and middle 1930's were concentrating on developing candy and cigarette vending, the big sirup producers, notably The Coca-Cola Co., were encouraging their bottlers to enter bottled soft drink vending. An ex-real-estate man, Elmer F. Pierson, and three associates, formed The Vendo Co. in Kansas City in 1936 to market a vending top for existing reach-in Coca-Cola coolers. By the time production of bottled drink machines was halted in 1942, tens of thousands of bottled soft drink machines were a familiar sight in service stations, grocery stores and other outlets. In 1938, Coca-Cola purchased a number of cup drink machines from Spacarb and secured a limited license from Spacarb on certain cup machine patents.

Considerable controversy raged in those days just before World War II between the proponents of cup drink machines which served only one kind of drink and proponents of machines to serve two or three different selections. In the thick of the battle in those days, as might be expected, were the major sirup companies who—like Curtiss Candy and Hershey Chocolate a decade earlier—saw all kinds of possibilities in vending machines which were exclusive outlets for their particular brands.

In 1938 Beverage Dispensers introduced a new single drink cup machine designed by Carl Hollinger who had been with Vendrink. This machine developed into the Thirst Quencher. In 1939, Albert Cole organized the Coledrink Co. in Chicago to build a single-flavor, postmix vender with a capacity of 350 cups. Sodamat Co. built a self-contained machine which failed to reach the market. Snead & Co., Jersey City, saw the Sodamat machine and began developing its own machine which reached the market in October 1940. Snead built 110 machines, about 70 of which went to Automatic Canteen, when the Government on April 30, 1942, ordered that all production of coin-operated machines be halted.

The 1930's were productive years which laid the groundwork for the tremendous expansion of the vending industry following World War II. Many of the developments of the thirties had to await the conclusion of the war to come into their own. The coin-operated laundry store is a good example. During the depression, it was common for some appliance dealers and utilities to attach coin metering devices to such major appliances as stoves and washing machines. When the user deposited coins to operate the device, he automatically made the payments which some day in the distant future would make the appliance his own. A few enterprising entrepreneurs discovered they could attach coin meters to washing machines, place the machines in apartment houses, and get a good return on their investment. Then, in 1936 in Buffalo, N.Y., an Easy washing machine dealer named Lars Hedstrom hit upon the idea of putting a number of coin-operated washing machines in a single store. He called his store the Launder-Ur-Own Station, and thus gave rise to a whole new kind of automatic service business.

During the 1930's it was likewise established that the vending operating company was an integral and essential component of the industry. Until the late 1920's, although there were numerous attempts to start organizations which resemble the modern operating company, vending machine manufacturers often as not sold their creations direct to the outlets where they were to be used. Not, indeed, until the operating company became a well-established factor did the business of manufacturing vending ma-

chines settle down and develop along substantial and profitable lines.

The necessity for presenting a solid front against legislative attacks caused a dozen vending industry leaders to meet in New York on September 14, 1936. At the conclusion of that meeting, National Automatic Merchandising Association had been formed with six of the dozen men present as the association's charter members: W. G. Fitzgerald, International Ticket Scale Co.; W. R. Fowler, F. & W. Products Co.; Robert Z. Greene, Rowe Manufacturing Co.; Nathaniel Leverone, Automatic Canteen Co. of America; E. V. Morava, Mills Automatic Merchandising Co., and A. Schlafer, Peerless Weighing & Vending Co. Present also was Clinton S. Darling, a professional trade association manager, who was to become the association's first manager and to guide it for the next quarter century.

When the War Production Board suspended the manufacture of vending machines in April 1942, the vending industry consisted for all practical purposes of machines to vend candy, cigarettes, gum, and soft drinks. The manufacturers of vending machines turned to the production of material for the Armed Forces, while the operating companies, numbering less than 3,000, struggled to keep going. Then as the war effort deepened, the challenge to the operating companies was intensified: Industrial plant managements, who had been at best tolerant of vending before, suddenly discovered that the vending machine was an invaluable tool for keeping workers on the job. Where once industrial management had feared the installation of vending machines would cause workers to dawdle on the job, they found men and women could work 10, 12, or longer hours at the job if they were refreshed occasionally with a candy bar or a soft drink. The demand for vending services was more than the industry could satisfy, either with machines or merchandise. This condition persisted throughout the war and after it.

After the war, the cycle of invention and promotion so characteristic of vending's very early days repeated itself. Perfume and cologne machines came on the market with considerable fanfare. A machine was introduced which vendiced ice cream cones. Shoe shine machines, invented many years earlier, were hailed as a brand new creation but failed to win acceptance when customers found their hose liberally covered with polish intended for the shoes.

In Chicago, Bert Mills, with a shock of gray hair now, but still as astonished by vending as he had been years ago when he was a schoolboy, brought out a machine which served coffee automatically in a cup. In Philadelphia, two young ex-servicemen, Floyd Rudd and K. C. Melikian, formed a company to make and operate a hot coffee vending machine they had invented and perfected. All of this was in 1946 and 1947, and at first a good many old hands at vending refused to take Rudd, Melikian, or Mills seriously. But the public did, and coffee vending was born. Then in the early fifties, Leslie Arnett, who put that first self-contained cold cup drink machine in Lincoln Park Zoo, unveiled the first vending machine which made coffee from coffee grounds rather than liquid concentrate or instant dry ingredients.

Nathaniel Leverone had his picture taken at Midway Airport in 1946 alongside of a new electronic marvel: A machine built by General Electric which would cook before your eyes a hot dog and deliver it so hot you couldn't hold it. The machine didn't work out. But the imagination of dozens of inventors and thousands of operators was captured and the industry began thinking seriously of vending complete meals.

In St. Louis and in Rockford, Ill., at National Rejectors and at ABT Manufacturing, engineers were struggling with mechanisms which would accept and identify and make change for paper currency. By 1960, the paper money changemaker would be a practical fact. Literally hundreds of small manufacturing companies came into being between 1945 and 1955, and some made lasting contributions to the industry. Eastern Electric, for example, which introduced in 1946 the first electrically actuated console cigarette vending machine and was subsequently sold, to the Seeburg Corporation.

Refrigeration and heat were added to vending machines so that hot and cold foods could be vended. Coin mechanisms were perfected so that machines could accept all popular denominations. Changelmakers were introduced—first as service machines, then built in as part of the machine itself until the changemaker is now a standard piece of equipment on most major vending machines.

In 1946, total vended volume amounted to \$600 million. By 1960, this had grown to \$2,586 million. The number of operating companies had increased from 3,500 in 1946 to 6,250 in 1960.

The improvements and inventions which always moved vending ahead continued: The multi-selection cigarette machine was built to accommodate the vastly changed preferences in cigarette brands. Apco revolutionized the cup-drink business with a machine which not only served the drink automatically but added ice as well. Wittenborg, a Danish firm, introduced the all-purpose vending machine to the U.S. industry, and the door was opened for vending batteries to replace mobile carts, snack counters and manual cafeterias in thousands of industrial plants, office buildings, colleges, and similar outlets.

As the business grew, it changed. Manufacturing companies, once family-owned enterprises, usually run by the inventive genius who started the company, merged with one another and marketed their stock to the public. Operating companies, who began the forties offering their customers one or two product lines, diversified so that they offered the customer a complete vending service. As they moved into automatic food service, some moved also into manual catering, or merged with established catering organizations or brought out catering organizations.

In 1946 the Automatic Canteen Co. had its stock listed on the New York Stock Exchange, the first vending company so listed. Then ABC Vending was formed and its stock was marketed publicly. Many major vending companies, operating organizations as well as manufacturers, now sell their stock through the exchanges or over the counter.

Vending had come a great long way since Thomas Adams installed his gum machines on the el platforms in New York City in 1888.

But the shape of things to come, the new applications of the vending principle are almost as big and broad as they were in Adams' day: Automatic restaurants and drive-ins for the public as well as many more automatic cafeterias for industry and institutions; automatic departments in grocery stores and drugstores, perhaps fully automatic stores or store branches in outlying areas; apartment house vending, a practical fact now with milk, perhaps extended tomorrow to other food lines. Each day, the vending machine provides needed services for millions of people. And each day the level of public confidence in the idea of vending is heightened and strengthened providing that necessary ingredient of public acceptance which stimulates growth and expansion.

Edward Clayton Sherman, 1877-1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, many leaders of note in the field of engineering have lived in my native State of Pennsylvania, including some who made important contributions in the design and building of the Panama Canal.

Among these was Edward Clayton Sherman, who was born January 11, 1877, at Kingston, Mass., and died on February 28, 1961, at Tyrone, Pa.

A vignette of him by Benton MacKaye, published in the September 1961 issue of the monthly Bulletin of the celebrated Cosmos Club of Washington, D.C., supplies concisely stated facts that could have been written only by one who knew Sherman and his background well.

The great work of Sherman's engineering career was the design of the Gatun and Miraflores spillways, key structures of the Panama Canal.

Arriving in the Canal Zone in 1909 as the result of an offer and appointment by Chief Engineer George W. Goethals, Sherman devoted all his tremendous capacity to his assigned tasks of designing these two major features in the canal project. Though he arrived on the isthmus later than other designers, he finished first and departed to take up other tasks, and thus became one of the unsung heroes of the Panama Canal.

Among the young engineers who worked under him was William R. McCann of Hopewell, Va., who supervised the installation of the machinery to operate the spillway gates at Gatun.

The spillways designed by Sherman have now been tested by nearly half a century of intensive operation, which has included periodic floods of the Chagres River, and have proved eminently satisfactory.

The vignette follows:

EDWARD CLAYTON SHERMAN, 1877-1961

(By Benton MacKaye)

"So you are joining our family, are you?"

These, the first words I ever heard from Ed Sherman, were said to me one late September afternoon in 1895 in Cambridge, Mass. Such his warm welcome to the ample mansion of No. 1 Berkeley Street: here my family was joining his for a sojourn together during the coming winter. They were five: father, mother, daughter, two sons; we were three: self, mother, and sister. I recall just how Ed looked: a smiling 6 feet of him; beside him another 6 feet of smiling elder brother.

It was classic Cambridge of the mid-Gay Nineties—twilight of the heyday of the interwar period, with the nonecognizant 60's far behind and the unsuspected Spanish War ahead. So when Ed showed up at the Cosmos Club 3 years ago it was like a transfer to a sphere where life was life and not a crisis. Berkeley Street, short and shaded, hard by the "Washington Elm," was typical of time and town. Along it there strolled leisurely together, on that salubrious afternoon, President Eliot and Thomas Wentworth Higginson. Later on we would see,

of nights, the cab of historian John Fluke returning him to his home at the farther end of the street.

I was preparing to enter Harvard the next year. Ed was already in MIT. So we were quasi-college mates. But our main contact was that of the family circle. Our two stocks, plus some close friends (including my brother Percy at Harvard), made a sort of spontaneous club. Indeed, we so dubbed ourselves—the "Tactless Club."

It was the day of charades. Home life was still biologic. Gadget worship was yet unknown; not even a radio to usurp conversation. Buttons were pressed to shed light but not laugh. Laughter was impulsive and not import; and it was our winter's main occupation. Fun was a potent force and not a pickled article. About once a fortnight we'd put on a home show. I recall Ed imitating the antics of a then renowned baseball pitcher (Andy Highlands of the Harvard Varsity); his long arms swinging the winding up whirls; his long legs outstretched, first one and then the other; his head cocked at first base; and then the climactic throw at the diamond.

I could give more but space forbids. It was off and on that I'd see Ed during the last pentad of the century. He would visit my room in college, and we'd take long walks together in the then real rural outskirts of old Cambridge.

His first job after graduation in 1898 was up on the St. Lawrence, wherefrom he'd return and recount his doings. From this experience he got an early look-in on the then far-future (now extant) Great Waterway. Later he had a real hand in the other continental surgery—at Panama. But I cannot relate, at firsthand, his engineering experience. Not since college had I seen him long enough for a real talk till 3 years ago. Then in a few brief meals we endeavored to cover the decades. Ed's daughter, Mrs. John W. Newlin, of Tyrone, Pa., sends a thorough account of her father's career. Here are the highpoints:

In 1877 (Jan. 11): Born at Kingston, Plymouth County, Mass. (With him I visited his old home there, imbibing the spirit of the famed South Shore and "Maritime Massachusetts.") He was son of Eben and Lucy (Burgess) Sherman.

In 1898: Graduated from MIT, bachelor of science in civil engineering. After St. Lawrence, assistant engineer, Charles River Basin Commission, designing works that now compass the famous enterprise of the Charles River Basin. (I recall his telling me about this. It was before either of us could see ahead far enough to appreciate the significance of this project in future American metropolitan planning.)

In 1907: Married Katharine Buck, of Bramwell, W. Va., daughter of Stuart M. Buck, a prominent mining engineer and mine operator.

In 1909: With the Isthmian Canal Commission. Of this Mrs. Newlin writes: "The offer and appointment came from Col. George W. Goethals, chairman and chief engineer, and was especially complimentary to Mr. Sherman's ability as it had not been sought or applied for by him. He was placed in charge of the designs of the Gatun and Miraflores spillway dams and was located at Culebra, C.Z."

In 1912: Returned to Boston and entered private practice, including work for two important commissions—Merrimack Valley Waterways and Massachusetts Railroad. Became first editor of the Journal of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers.

In 1917: With the U.S. entrance in World War I, in Navy Department, designing engineer, Bureau of Docks and Yards, Washington. Promoted to project manager, wherein he continued until retirement in 1936.

In 1918: Commander, U.S. Naval Reserve Force. Later given the Silver Star citation by the Secretary of the Navy. Decorated also with the French Medal, Officer de l'Instruction Publique.

After retirement (1936) continued residence in Washington, with much traveling in Europe, United States, and Canada. During World War II took active part in naval service and on rationing board.

In 1952: Mrs. Sherman died. Edward moved to Tyrone, Pa.

In 1961 (February 28): Edward died in Tyrone, at the home of Mrs. Newlin (1400 North Avenue). Mrs. Newlin writes: "He is survived also by one son, Edward C. Sherman, Jr., of San Francisco, Calif., and by seven grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. Interment was in the National Cemetery, Arlington, Va. Mr. Sherman was a member of the Cosmos Club in Washington (October 7, 1918). He was a Fellow of the American Society of Civil Engineers."

Ed was not among "the brass," or among many of the headlines. Headlines were made by such as "St. Lawrence," "Charles River Basin," and "Panama." When reading these one wonders who are the men behind them. One of them was Edward Sherman.

Chickens Do Come Home To Roost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of 1960 and early in 1961 we heard a great deal about getting America moving, when many were of the opinion it had not slowed to the extent pictured. The one thing which definitely has moved—upward—is our national debt.

An editorial which appeared in the September 18 issue of the Wall Street Journal agrees in retrospect with doubts raised in my mind and expressed on numerous occasions when the housing, depressed areas, and minimum wage bills were under discussion. The most rabid proponent would probably admit—secretly—that the silver lining has not appeared to the degree anticipated.

Assuming the following editorial is correct, I can at least say, "I told you so":

ON GETTING MOVING

Of the many explanations being offered for the Kennedy program's decidedly mixed performance in Congress, it seems to us the most persuasive is simply that the White House misjudged the temper of the times.

Here was an energetic young President who had campaigned on a pledge to "get America moving," surrounded by eager young men presumably full of ideas about that motion, supported by majorities of his own party in both Houses of Congress. Not surprisingly a lot of people expected to see a flurry of legislative activity reminiscent of Franklin Roosevelt's first Congress. Yet the upshot, as the 87th Congress trudges toward the end of its first session, is something far less sensational.

To be sure, Congress, gave Mr. Kennedy some of the highly dubious things he asked. Apart from relatively noncontroversial military spending boosts, his notable successes

were the housing, depressed-areas and minimum-wage bills.

These were no victories for the Nation. The wildly extravagant, hodgepodge housing measure is, among other evils, inflationary. The depressed-areas bill can be expected to have results contrary to those ostensibly intended. The minimum wage increase and expansion of coverage is causing fresh unemployment. Along with some lesser projects, the housing and depressed-areas laws add to the deficits, debt and inflationary danger which are so rapidly burdening the Nation.

Still, these actions, damaging as they are, are not dramatic new departures; rather they are expansions of programs already in existence or long under discussion. Where the President signally failed to achieve his aims, as Mr. Novak observed in an article on this page recently, was in his attempts to wrest prerogatives from Congress and in his attempts to take the country into new and unexamined ventures.

Thus Congress refused to abandon to the President its responsibility for annual appropriations, in this case for foreign aid. Congress refused to transfer to the executive branch its responsibilities in the field of farm policy.

And Congress refused to sanction some of the more extreme Kennedy proposals for moving the Government into new areas of control—in particular the program for compulsory medical care of the aged, an item of unimagined scope, and the sweeping school-aid bill, so costly in terms of money and loss of local discretion.

Now it would seem plain that if Congress shared Mr. Kennedy's campaign view of the dismal state of the Nation, it would be prepared to do almost anything he said was necessary to get moving. But how could any sensible person, in or out of Congress, conclude that the American economy of 1961, the envy of the world, was in some kind of desperate shape?

Anyway, what did the administration have to offer in the way of remedies for such ills as exist? Nothing but the worn-out prescriptions of the thirties: More Government spending, more Government control. It seems that the bright young men in Washington today are not, after all, full of bright new ideas.

Inevitably, a distrust of such simple solutions has been developing in the country over the years. There has been a growing realization that the springs of economic growth and sound prosperity lie not in Government but in the freest exercise of individual choice, and that this trend toward constantly extending the blanket of Government is not a liberating development, but a stultifying one. This revulsion against the Federal solution for everything has been reflected in the mood of the present session.

Congress, we believe, has little reason to be proud of those actions producing more spending and statism. But at least Congress has displayed some ability to stop, look, and listen. And when one weighs the Kennedy program against the congressional result, it is clear that the country could be moving in much worse ways.

A Peace Corps in Reverse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the National Review of September 23, 1961,

contains the following item which I am sure provides not only a workable, but also a worthwhile plan:

A PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE?

(By David N. Rowe)

The Peace Corps, reputedly a pet project of President Kennedy's inner circle adviser Walt W. Rostow, plans to send considerable numbers of American teachers, technicians, etc., to work in foreign countries during the next several years. These individuals, recruited from the ranks of recent graduates, will be briefly trained in the United States in the language and cultural background of the host nation. Once abroad, they will be required to live and work as close to the level of the local population as possible, although just how this will be done in each area has yet to be seen. This scheme, depend on it, will cost a great deal of money.

The hoped-for results of the Peace Corps could be achieved at much less expense and with far greater efficiency by other means. For the talent is available in the persons of the many foreign students who have been brought here since the war to be trained in just the skills and techniques the Peace Corps is meant to provide. There are literally thousands of these trainees here. Only a few have returned home at the conclusion of their course of study to help their countries achieve cultural, economic, and political advances.

FOREIGN STUDENTS STAY HERE

To understand what this means to their countries of origin we must remember that the students who have come here from Asia and, with increasing frequency today, from Africa, are the intellectual cream of their societies. Competition for education is very sharp, the academic discipline in many Asian countries very severe, and the graduates, whatever the character of their curricula, do represent the very highest levels of qualifications available.

It is usually the ambition of the overwhelming majority of these graduates to go abroad for further study. So by allowing most of these trainees to stay here we are depriving their countries of their best intellectual resources. Asian students are naturally attracted by the high standard of living in the United States. In addition, they have found that they can successfully compete with Americans for jobs. American research and educational institutions, hospitals, business and technical enterprises are glad to employ them. With the aid of friendly and interested Americans these foreign students are able to circumvent laws which require their return home. This is not too difficult. The student may simply not conclude his study program. He will, for example, encounter delays in completing a dissertation. Time limits for completion of graduate work are not enforced in many graduate schools. Some students enlist the sympathy and assistance of their professors, many of whom are anxious to keep them on as research workers.

The student from abroad can also marry an American girl, and thus place a real obstruction against the rules requiring his departure. His position is still stronger if he has a child born in this country who under our laws is entitled to American citizenship. Other students, less in demand in the professions, simply go underground, taking jobs as waiters, photo laboratory workers, etc., in large cities.

Much of the financial support of these students is provided by the U.S. Government and by private and public American foundations and agencies, with the object of helping to train an intellectual, cultural, economic, and technical elite for poorer nations. Instead of seeing to it that these trained young men and women are in fact

returned to our friends and allies abroad, we allow them to remain.

On a recent trip to Asia I found American cultural workers there keenly aware of this problem. How could they help get the student from Asia to return home? Most of them urged sharp curtailment of recruitment and support of Asian students for study in America if a clear answer to that question is not forthcoming.

In face of this, the proposed Peace Corps of young Americans appears to many abroad as a laughable and totally inadequate expedient. Why teach a few Americans a little of some difficult language, and give them a smattering of knowledge of a particular local culture, when we have here in the United States available for such work thousands of natives of those countries who are (whether our bureaucrats know it or not) thoroughly conversant in their own languages and culture.

RESTITUTION

Part of the money we are now planning to spend on the Peace Corps should be used to send home foreign students we have trained; we could help provide them with better job opportunities, and perhaps even contribute something to their immediate local environment so that they will better readjust to the change.

The U.S. Government has invested large sums in training Asians here. It is preparing to spend more, and is being pressed to do so. But if the practices of the immediate past are to be followed still further, this will only result in great loss to the countries we are attempting to help.

It is high time we stopped raiding the intellectual resources of our friends and allies. We should begin to make restitution, by returning every possible trainee or ex-trainee now in this country who has either completed his training or has been here a certain specified length of time. We might decide to accept from any given country each year only as many new trainees as there are students from that country who have returned from the United States during the previous year. But to do this, we must tighten the enforcement of regulations now on the books, and add such new rules as the situation may require.

We can thus put an end to the Peace Corps in reverse that foreign student trainees in this country now constitute.

Complex Problems of the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry today is confronted with a multitude of complex problems. In the night of this confusion, the textile industry, nonetheless, persists in looking for a star of hope and listening for a rustle of encouragement.

In view of our Government's persistently erratic and uncertain trade policy on textiles, one cannot help but wonder just how long this patient and long-suffering industry is going to have to watch, wait, and listen for the arrival of something positive in the way of textile trade relationships.

Mr. Speaker, pertinent to this comment I insert into the RECORD two arti-

cles, one from a September 25 publication of the U.S. News & World Report and the other from the September 16 issue of the Portland Press Herald:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 25, 1961]

BUSINESS AROUND THE WORLD

In an arrangement that made nobody really very happy, the United States and Japan have just agreed on a 7- to 8-percent increase in Japanese exports of cotton fabrics and apparel to the United States in 1962.

Japanese textile interests wanted a 30-percent increase.

U.S. textile interests have objected to the present level of imports.

The Japanese have restricted textile exports to the United States since 1956.

During the last 3 years, Hong Kong's textile exports to the United States have been skyrocketing. In other words, the Japanese share of the U.S. import market has been shrinking. This situation has made the Japanese furious. United States pressure on Hong Kong to curb their exports has been unavailing thus far.

Textile manufacturers in the United States have clamored loudly at the increasing competition from low-wage countries such as Japan and Hong Kong.

However, the U.S. industry has managed traditionally to export more cotton fabrics than were imported. Exports, for example, in the first 6 months this year more than doubled imports into this country.

Imports of certain types of cotton clothing from the Far East have been very heavy in the last 2 years and have glutted the U.S. market.

Squawks from U.S. clothing manufacturers have been persistent. Labor unions affected also have become perturbed at the volume of imports.

The Kennedy administration would like to see both textile imports and textile exports climb to higher levels—gradually, under controlled conditions.

At the same time, it's clear that administration officials are impressed with the British Government's approach to a similar textile problem.

The British Government has forced a contraction of the textile industry, closing down the least economic units that were unable to compete with foreign production. Government loans eased the transition of both workers and plants to other lines of activity.

Washington officials are tossing around similar ideas for subsidizing a sweating down of the U.S. textile industry, as well as other lines that develop extreme difficulty in competing with foreign production.

This concept ties directly into administration strategy for securing congressional authority next year to negotiate sweeping tariff reductions.

Access to the European Common Market is a necessity. Especially will this be true if Britain and other nations join the Common Market.

But the Common Market will be discriminating increasingly against outside goods, including American products, for a number of years. That's because the internal tariff walls between member countries are reduced well before the common exterior tariff is lowered. Result could be a decline of 10 percent in U.S. exports to Western Europe within a very short time.

So, in order to bargain with the Common Market for lower tariffs, the United States must be prepared to make substantial tariff cuts on imports—perhaps on virtually all imports from the industrialized Common Market countries.

Extensive tariff cuts will undoubtedly hurt some U.S. industries. Hence a multi-billion-dollar plan will be proposed to subsidize industries injured by tariff cuts. This is the

sop now being considered to assuage protectionist interests in the Congress, industry, and the ranks of labor.

The tariff fight next year is expected to be knockdown, drag out.

[From the Portland Press Herald, Sept. 16, 1961]

NEW TRADE POLICY COMING, NORTHERN TEXTILE MEN TOLD

POLAND SPRING.—Assistant Secretary of Commerce Hickman Price, Jr., said here Friday that as a result of the international industrial revolution of the last decade, a new foreign trade policy is emerging in this country.

Price spoke to over 400 members and guests attending the 107th annual meeting of the Northern Textile Association.

Steps to implement the policy for the textile industry have been taken through the Geneva agreement last July and a recent agreement with Japan, Price told the group.

"It will be the policy of the United States to maintain the level of cotton imports during the year ending next June 30 at, or close to the level of imports for the year ended June 30, 1961," the speaker said.

New long-term agreements should be concluded before next June, he said, "which should provide an orderly development of world textile markets that will preserve for the domestic industry the markets which through effective promotion they themselves have created and deserve."

President Charles F. Phillips, of Bates College, told the association foreign aid can do little to help countries which fail to institute basic economic and social reforms.

"We are in the early stages of a vast new program of financial aid of Latin America," Dr. Phillips said. "In fact, the proposed program may easily involve \$30 billion over the next decade."

"But even this huge sum will do little to aid the people of Latin America unless these nations institute a number of essential reforms. Too many of these countries are operating with unbalanced budgets, so that inflation is rampant. In Brazil, for example, the cost of living has advanced 26 percent in the past year."

Dr. Phillips pointed to other examples of necessary reforms; an end to discrimination against outside capital, more equitable tax laws, widespread ownership of land, better educational systems, improved roads and ports. Countries not undertaking these essential reforms should be denied foreign aid, he said.

"Finally, we know that a free society is rooted in a private economy. Hence, we should immediately withdraw aid from any country which uses our funds to develop socialism instead of encouraging the expansion of private enterprise."

A meeting of the Wool Manufacturers Council Friday morning opened the day's program.

George A. Door, Jr., of Guild, N.H., was re-elected chairman of the council. He presided at the breakfast session and led the discussion on: "The Current Situation in Imports of Wool Textiles."

Roger M. Grimade of Charlton, Mass., presided at the general morning session. Richard R. McNabb, secretary of Machinery & Allied Products Industry, Washington, D.C., was moderator of a panel discussion on the "Promise and Problems of Automation."

Speakers were Dr. L. H. Hance, president of the Institute of Textile Technology, Charlottesville, Va.; James R. Bright, professor of business administration, Harvard University, and James R. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

At the afternoon session, a panel of experts on textile manufacture discussed, "Modern American Built Textile Machinery."

J. B. Goldberg, New York textile consultant, was moderator.

Members of the panel were J. Woodward Hubbard, vice president, Saco-Lowell Shops, Easley, S.C., who discussed preparatory and spinning equipment; William K. Child, executive vice president, Draper Corp., Hopedale, Mass., who covered progress in weaving machinery; and James H. Hunter, president, James Hunter Machine Co., North Adams, Mass., who presented the paper on modern finishing techniques.

Berlin Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we face renewed Berlin crises, of necessity our thoughts must run back to their origin; namely, the wartime agreements which brought about this situation. The Washington Evening Star, of September 15, contains an editorial of special significance in that it very calmly reviews some of the history relating to the creation of the Berlin dilemma. Comprehension of the present and the future depends to a great degree on an understanding of the past, and therefore, I ask leave to insert into the Record at this time the editorial entitled "Berlin Background":

BERLIN BACKGROUND

There certainly was ample reason for the annoyance with which former President Eisenhower is reported to have received word of a State Department publication picturing him as responsible for the decision to let the Russians capture Berlin in World War II. For this, to say the least, was a grossly distorted version of history, and Secretary of State Rusk was well advised to disclaim any intent to criticize the wartime role of General Eisenhower.

Some day, presumably, the whole story of the Berlin decision—a decision which confronts us now with a monstrous dilemma—will become public property. As of today, however, only some of the facts are known.

It seems clear that General Eisenhower, as the war was drawing to its close, did not consider Berlin to be a major military objective, and advancing American forces were held up at the Elbe some 75 miles from the capital of Nazi Germany. Under political agreements previously made, however, our troops would have had to pull back even if they had taken Berlin.

The original agreement was negotiated in London in September 1944, by the European Advisory Commission, consisting of representatives of the United States, Britain, and Russia. Our representative was the late Ambassador John G. Winant who, some 3 years later, took his own life.

It was this agreement which established the zones of occupation in conquered Germany, with Berlin 110 miles inside Communist-held territory and with no guaranteed routes of access. But who was responsible for this monumental error of judgment, later ratified by the chiefs of state at Yalta? It is hardly credible that Mr. Winant, at the level of Ambassador to the Court of St. James, made this decision on his own responsibility. He must have acted in consultation with or with the approval of his superiors in Washington. But the public record on this point reveals little or nothing.

All that one can be sure of is that the political decision of 1944, based apparently on a naive trust in Russian good faith, leaves us today faced with what is probably the gravest crisis in our national history.

Protecting and Promoting the American Way of Life in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 29 of this year, Dr. James T. Ralph, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Agricultural Stabilization, addressed a meeting of ASC committeemen in California. In his speech, he analyzed the recently considered administration farm proposals and congressional action in the context of an analysis of the farmers' economic position.

Dr. Ralph's speech, which follows, is a noteworthy contribution to present thinking about the farm problem:

PROTECTING AND PROMOTING THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, members of the State and county ASC committees, fellow employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it is my pleasure to bring you the personal greetings of Secretary Freeman. The Secretary shares fully my appreciation and admiration for the great contribution you are making to the administration of farm programs.

Your meeting is important to the future of California agriculture. And there are many subjects I could use in talking to such a distinguished group.

I could review for you the history of our system of farmer-elected committees, but you have been a part of that history and know it better than I.

I could review the record of the Kennedy administration in agriculture in the first 8 months—the first Executive order signed by the President was the move to distribute our abundance to the needy—the first major piece of legislation was the feed grain bill—the first appropriation bill enacted by the 87th Congress was for agriculture—and the first long-range plan passed by the Congress was the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Agriculture is in the forefront of the Kennedy administration.

I could talk to you about the tremendous team President Kennedy has put together in the Department of Agriculture.

Orville Freeman, of Minnesota, a man whose dedication is surpassed only by his energy for the task. An outstanding administrator who is determined to correct the misdirection that has been given to thinking on agriculture in recent years. A leader who would cause us to think of our capacity to produce in terms of an asset rather than a liability. And a Secretary of Agriculture who has repeatedly recognized and complimented the outstanding job you have done in the front lines of our action programs.

Charles Murphy, of North Carolina, a distinguished lawyer skilled in the ways of government. A man whose sagacity, administrative ability, and soundness of judgment are unexcelled anywhere in the top echelons of Washington.

John Duncan, former president of one of the finest farm organizations in America—

the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation—a relatively large farmer who is completely devoted to the cause of assisting smaller farmers to share in America's abundance.

Frank Welch, dean of two agricultural colleges in his time and probably the outstanding man of the land-grant college system of America.

John A. Baker, a hill-county boy from Arkansas who has long served farm people in Washington. A great humanitarian who brings to his post as Director of Agricultural Credit a matchless measure of sympathetic understanding for the problems of farm people.

Willard Cochrane, a great economist who as Director of Economic Research has shown the rare capacity to shed light while absorbing heat where the basic problems of agriculture are concerned.

I could talk to you about our distinguished corps of career men in the Department many of whom you know personally including some outstanding native sons of California. We have the finest staff of any department in government, noted not only for their intelligence and ability, but more so their dedication, their pride in the industry they serve, and their complete loyalty to the cause of American agriculture.

I could take my whole time on your program today talking about career men who worked up from the ranks to positions of responsible leadership. Men like Horace Godfrey, Red Jacobs, Tom Miller, and many others who bring to their offices a wealth of knowledge, experience, and seasoned judgment seldom found in the higher posts of any organization.

But I want to talk to you about something dear to all of us and something closely connected with our mission of stabilization: Protecting and promoting the American way of life in agriculture.

A. WORLD'S BEST SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SYSTEM

When our forefathers began this country they embraced a social and economic system based on two principles. These were:

1. Widespread ownership of productive resources and,
2. Private enterprise with competition.

The wisdom of our forefathers has not been disproven over the years. Our way of life has given us a higher level of goods and services to enjoy than has been enjoyed by any civilization in mankind's history. Even the average workingman in America today enjoys a more comfortable life than the upper classes of many other areas. Yet along with an abundance of goods and services our people have time left over for the spiritual and cultural activities of their choice.

B. A REBELLION AGAINST OTHER SYSTEMS

Our Founding Fathers did not chance upon this way of life by accident. They came here from other areas and had observed other systems. In Europe, at the time our ancestors departed, all land and other resources were owned by only a few families. The fathers of our republic knew of the stifling effect this feudalistic pattern of ownership had upon individual initiative. They had experienced an economic system called mercantilism. In mercantilism the reason for all production was to increase the wealth of the king or other potentate. Such a system smothered both incentive and invention. No man will give his all to his work unless he and his family get a fair share of the fruits of his labor.

The founders of our republic had been exposed to the idea of a Scotsman named Adam Smith who maintained that, if every man is allowed to pursue his own selfish interest he will produce more goods for the good of all. This is not only the rationale of private enterprise but it is the reason our system has worked so well. Every man has an opportunity to better himself and his family.

C. THE DANGER TO THE SYSTEM

We believe in this system. Its merits are self-evident. But we are concerned. Our system is not only endangered by alien philosophies from without but it is endangered by imbalances within. That segment of our people which has made the greatest contribution toward our economic well-being is not sharing equitably in the bounty they have created.

I speak of the efficient commercial family farmers of America. Our farmers through hard work, thrift, and investment have made possible the economic progress we enjoy. By continually becoming more efficient American farmers have released labor and other resources to other industries to produce the other goods and services we enjoy.

Farmers are not receiving a fair share of what they have made possible. In other industries producers and consumers alike share the benefits of our great system but in agriculture a major portion of the benefits have accrued to the consumer.

The simple fact is that while we as consumers get our foods and fibers at a lower relative cost in America than in any other country—efficient producers in agriculture are not receiving a return on their capital, their labor, and their management consistent with returns being earned by efficient producers in other industries.

D. WIDESPREAD OWNERSHIP IN AGRICULTURE DIFFERENT FROM OTHER INDUSTRIES

Private enterprise leads to efficient production by emphasizing individual initiative and the profit motive. Widespread ownership insures the popularity of the system by having the maximum number of citizens share the entrepreneurial or risk taking function. Large numbers of property owning citizens gives us stability and our great social strength. (Political and social stability is essential for economic progress in any system.)

Although widespread ownership in agriculture—the family farm system is the strongest thread in our system it also creates problems for farmers. Thousands of independent farmers are unable to regulate production and marketing of their product to obtain a fair price in the marketplace.

E. INDUSTRY AND LABOR HAVE ENABLING ACTS

Other industries also have widespread ownership. But it creates no serious problem. This is partly because other industries sell nonperishable products. But mostly because other industries can organize efficiently into a small number of firms. Few enough not only to regulate supply but in many cases to administer prices. This is possible only because they have enabling acts.

The corporation laws of the States and the Securities and Exchange Commission Act are enabling acts for industry. If the organizing of corporations were not regulated and if the Securities and Exchange Commission did not supervise the sale and exchange of securities then it would be impossible for the organizers of industry to amass the capital necessary to operate firms of the size which dominate most manufacturing industries. The thousands of investors (widespread ownership) in American industry would lack the confidence to invest if these acts did not regulate the formation of corporations and the sale and exchange of securities; and if industry could not secure the capital to organize into a small number of large companies they could not control either the total supply or the price of their products.

Even our laboring people have enabling acts. The Wagner Labor Relations Act and other laws concerning organized labor give skilled and unskilled workers the right to organize together into unions and to bargain collectively for a price on the services they sell.

Many of our trades and professions have enabling acts to allow them to regulate the quality or supply of the services they offer. The medical profession, for example, has many restrictions to regulate the quality of the service they offer. Regulation of quality also restricts supply and thereby raises the rates that may be charged. Most States require bar examinations of anyone who would practice law. This examination tends to improve quality but it also limits the number of lawyers. Even barbers have secured laws to require licensing and sometimes schooling to practice their trade.

All laws which allow a business or profession to regulate itself are enabling acts. Practices which tend to reduce supply also tend to raise incomes. Other business and professions in America have done well by themselves. The economic tools they employ are: (1) Promotion to increase demand for their product both on a brand and industry scale; (2) research to find greater uses for their products; (3) quality control to cut down on the supply of goods or services and at the same time increase confidence in its use; (4) surplus diversion to divert part of a product to a lower price market or hold a quantity for marketing at a later date; (5) marketing quotas to avoid the creation of a surplus.

Why not allow farmers to copy these methods.

F. GOVERNMENT ACTION PROGRAMS TO EQUALIZE BARGAINING STRENGTH

Since 1929 the Government has attempted to stabilize agriculture. Programs were operated only for the basics because only in basic crops could we produce a supply greatly in excess of demand. Since 1938 farm prices have been supported by means of nonrecourse loans.

Government-action programs have worked well when designed well. They have accomplished their purpose when administered by a friendly administrator.

We believe these programs were and are justified. We believe that efficient producers in agriculture are entitled to as good a return on their investment, management, and labor as efficient producers in other necessary industries; and we believe Government should give farmers the tools to obtain a fair share of the bounty they create. Government action programs are, however, subject to several dangers. First, an unfriendly administrator can prevent such programs from working as intended by Congress.

Second, during the past few years an increasingly urban public has become less sympathetic toward the problems of agriculture. As the people of our cities get more and more generations away from the farm, they have less and less sympathy for the problems of the farmer. This expresses itself in a growing reluctance on the part of the Congress to appropriate funds for price stabilization programs.

A third factor, and one often overlooked is that we are attaining the ability to produce more and more farm products in excess of what the market will take at a profit. Therefore, greater and greater demands upon the resources available to the Department of Agriculture to stabilize farm prices may be forthcoming. Already many industries which do not have price support programs and which maintain they do not wish price support programs are asking for greater utilization of section 32 funds. At the same time many agricultural industries are asking for high tariffs to protect them from import competition. And with increasing development of the developing nations of the world we can expect a great drive to export food products to the American market.

The need for an enabling act to give farmers tools to self-regulate themselves was never greater.

G. BILL OF RIGHTS FOR AGRICULTURE

The Kennedy administration proposed just such an enabling act in the Agricultural Act of 1961. We asked for a "Bill of Rights for Agriculture." Allow farmers to self-regulate themselves as other industries are self-regulated. To have research, promotion, quality control, surplus diversion or marketing quotas.

One tool enjoyed by many industries was not proposed for agriculture. That is the ability to administer its prices.

H. THE ACT OF 1961 AS AGREED TO BY CONGRESS

The administration's long-range farm program has been enacted by the Congress. Some have the impression that this program was pretty well taken apart. We did not get all that was asked. But we got most of it. This is a tremendously important piece of legislation. It will lead to more effective action to promote and protect American agriculture. Provisions of the Farmers Home Administration credit program were liberalized. The school milk program was continued, Public Law 480 was extended, and two highly significant commodity programs were enacted. Our feed grain program with minor changes was extended, and a similar program was adopted for wheat.

We achieved a breakthrough on a long-range plan for agriculture. A plan for farmers to set up and operate their own stabilization programs. The Marketing Agreements Act of 1937 has not been substantially amended since its passage 24 years ago. This self-help law was changed in two respects. First, promotion and research were recognized as economic tools available to farmers. Second, additional commodities not before eligible for self-help programs were added in this bill. Cherries, apples, turkeys, turkey hatching eggs, peanuts, cranberries, seed crops, and others.

Due, I believe to a great amount of misunderstanding, lambs, honey, and other commodities were stricken from this bill. Some thought that this bill would set up production controls. This was not the case.

Production controls were not proposed. Even marketing quotas were stricken from the bill early in its consideration.

Others failed to understand this act would not set up any program for any industry. The procedures of self-help are not generally understood. Marketing orders are always initiated by the industry concerned. They are always designed by industry committees. They can become effective only after public hearing and a referendum of all producers affected. Even after this no action can be taken until a producer nominated board or a committee is selected and recommends action. Therefore, the administration did not propose a program for the producers of any agricultural commodities. What we did propose was that they have legal authority to adopt a program if they wished to do so.

I. PROCEDURE PROVIDED FOR ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION

The Congress recognized possible need for additional authority and wisely provided a procedure.

Subtitle A of title I: "Consultation on Agricultural Programs"—is the most significant provision of this act.

Farmers and farm groups may call the Secretary of Agriculture to form a committee to consult and advise on additional legislation or administrative programs.

The Department is authorized to pay expenses of commodity committee members.

Committee recommendations will be submitted to the Secretary and to Congress if additional legislation is suggested.

The Congress has not said that additional authority will be provided. But a procedure has been established for industry to initiate action.

The door is wide open. We are prepared to consider any request received from a representative commodity group.

J. MISLEADING CRITICISM

Although this act would have farmers themselves develop farm programs it has been criticized by some who maintain they represent farmers.

1. It was said this proposal would give the Secretary too much power. The Secretary already had more power than this act gives him. The Secretary had the power to support the price of any agricultural commodity at somewhere between 0 and 90 percent of parity unless the range is further circumscribed by other legislation and the Secretary may exercise this power without consulting anyone in the industry or the Congress. This act dilutes this power and gives producers a larger measure of responsibility for program development.

2. This act is said to delegate legislative power to the Secretary of Agriculture. This does delegate some legislative power to the Secretary. But power no greater than he now has. Secretaries of Agriculture have had considerable legislative power delegated to them since the Smith-Hughes and Smith-Lever Acts were passed.

3. It has been said that producers through a producer board are enabled to exercise legislative power. This is the heart of our plan. Producer boards would be delegated legislative power through the Secretary of Agriculture. Producers boards have exercised such quasi-legislative power under Federal marketing orders for 25 years and they have done an outstanding job.

4. It has been suggested that this program would cost billions of dollars. This program would cost less than the present price-support programs. We cannot say how much, but we can definitely say it would cost less. First, it gives the Secretary more realistic methods of adjusting supply under the wheat and feed grain programs. Second, more commodities are allowed to operate and pay for their own program. As more commodities adopt self-help under this act, the cost of stabilization will go down. Taxpayers cost of running 80 milk marketing orders and 42 fruit and vegetable orders is insignificant compared with cost of the soil bank and price-support programs.

5. It has been suggested that this would regiment agriculture. If and only if other industries, trades, and professions are regimented, then this act would indeed allow farmers to regiment themselves. There is nothing compulsory in this law. It merely gives more farmers the right to organize and if they wish, to run (by a producer-handler board) and pay for their own program. If copying the methods used in the remainder of the American economy is regimentation, then farmers would be allowed to regiment themselves.

6. This program has been criticized because it threatens to raise farm income. We accept that criticism as valid.

Under the self-help provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1961, farmers would earn their income from what they do rather than what they failed to do. This does not provide farmers a tailor-made solution to their economic problems. It only gives them a license for hard work. The hard work of designing, initiating, securing approval, voting in, and administering and paying for their own economic stabilization.

This act of 1961 proposes a conservative rather than a liberal approach. It seeks to conserve and protect the existing way of life in American agriculture and to do so by copying methods proven by other industries rather than be designing new methods.

We believe this is a practical program. We believe it easier to give farmers, who are 9 percent of our people, the power to copy

other industries than to attempt to reform the other 91 percent of our economy.

The task of changing 91 percent of our economy staggers the imagination.

To think of reforming the other 91 percent is impractical. The self-regulation they have is sensible and workable. We have no criticism of other industries. They have designed a workable system of self-regulation. We believe the best approach to stabilization in agriculture is to give farmers the legal power to join the mainstream of the American economy by acting as other industries act.

I submit to you that anyone who is in favor of more economics and less politics in agricultural stabilization; anyone who believes in representative democracy in agriculture; anyone who has faith that farmers can run their own business if given the legal tools to do so should be in favor of this program.

Our system of private enterprise with widespread ownership has proven its worth. The wisdom of our forefathers has been demonstrated. The need for preserving this system is self-evident.

If we would protect this system we must continue in business as many individual entrepreneurs in agriculture as is consistent with economic efficiency. The greatest danger to our private enterprise system is to have too few people personally connected with it. By giving our independent farmers and handlers in agriculture the bargaining strength to maintain themselves in business, we are insuring a greater number of people with a connection with, a kinship to, an interest in and, therefore, an affinity for the private enterprise capitalistic system itself.

Our farmers have achieved for us the dream men have sought throughout the centuries. To be able to produce more food than is needed. American farmers produce not only enough food and fiber for our own needs but also vast quantities to help supply the needs of millions throughout the world. This is an achievement of far greater consequence than putting a man in space. Meat, milk, poultry, fruits and vegetables in the hand are far closer to man's basic needs than a star in the sky. There is no better propaganda in all the world than the success story of American agriculture.

I suggest to you that our greatest defense against communism or socialism is to preserve, to protect, to promote this wonderful system of efficient commercial family farms we have in America. This system is the strongest thread in the fabric of our society. The Agricultural Act of 1961, by giving farmers the tools to obtain equal bargaining strength with other segments in our society, is a long step forward in preserving our system.

Peace Corps Boondoggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress was considering the question of appropriating money for the operation of the Peace Corps, an editorial appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat commenting on several of the salient points of the proposed program. At the time I read it I intended to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but the rush of a session closing

caused me to overlook it. Nonetheless, the tenor of the editorial and the observations it makes are still of value and I believe that it will serve well to have this editorial made available for the Congress through the RECORD. For this reason I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Sept. 10, 1961]

PEACE CORPS BOONDOGGLE

The House of Congress will be asked, probably this week, to spend \$40 million to put the Peace Corps in business. The best thing the House can do is turn down the request and strangle this misfit in the cradle.

It is our bet that the Corps is as much an embarrassment to President Kennedy as it is to the rest of us. It should be. He proposed it in an unthinking moment during the campaign, and now it has come back to haunt him, and us.

It is obvious that the Corps has no real job to do that isn't being done better already, by someone else. For example, under its point 4 program, this country is sending abroad many technicians to impart their skills to untrained foreign workmen.

Point 4 is far more useful in conveying useful skills and information to backward peoples than the Peace Corps can ever hope to be.

The United States spends millions of dollars every year on the Voice of America and the U.S. Information Agency to create a good public damage of this Nation all over the world.

A Peace Corps, composed largely of immature college men, is more likely to blacken that image than brighten it.

Turn 2,700 of these youngsters loose to go native and there will be more "Ugly Americans" creating ill will for us abroad than a multimillion dollar public relations program will ever be able to erase.

In addition, our Federal agencies help pay for an ambitious exchange program. They send Americans overseas, to teach or study, and bring many African, Asian, and Latin American students or teachers to our colleges and universities.

Our exchange program is doing more to convince the world of our peaceful progress and intentions than the Corps could ever accomplish.

Finally, as it was pointed out on the floor of the U.S. Senate, there are some 135,000 dedicated American missionaries, among them doctors, nurses and other technicians, of all faiths, who are healing the sick, comforting the afflicted, sheltering the widow and orphan, all over the world.

Yet, even they have not yet won the world to work for a society of peace and order. What can 2,700 corpsmen do?

In fact, the Peace Corps threatens to become simply a boondoggle, for bureaucrats and beatniks. Under the bill, approved in the Senate, to spend \$40 million on the Corps next year, the Corps would be topheavy with well-paid headquarters brass in Washington.

The Corps is authorized to employ 275 full-time executive personnel in Washington, plus special "consultants" and "country representatives." Ten would be in a pay bracket up to \$15,030 a year; 25 in the \$15,030 to \$19,000 class.

As of late August, the Corps had 121 chiefs in its Washington office, and only 462 volunteers taking field training. Also, although corpsmen will get only \$75 a month as pay, they will be provided with many other comforts of home—their keep, health care, clothing and other amenities of Government service.

Worse still, some evidently look on the Corps as a way to duck military service. Director Sargent Shriver encouraged this, perhaps inadvertently, when he promised

that everyone will "get a deferment from the draft while you are in the Peace Corps."

The Senate stopped that by adopting an amendment which states that service in the Corps will not be, in itself, grounds for deferment.

The Senate also tacked on other amendments in an attempt to make the Corps less likely to be a wasteful boondoggle—a sort of exotic, overseas CCC for college boys.

But the Senate stopped short at what many Members knew was the right thing to do: Kill it, before it backfires and does the country real damage abroad.

That task, we hope, the House will take care of.

Senate Blocks Veterans Compensation Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the following item from Paraplegia News, September 1961 issue, should be of interest, I am sure, to all veterans:

SENATE BLOCKS VETERANS COMPENSATION INCREASE

One of the major pieces of legislation introduced in the 87th Congress was H.R. 879 which would increase compensation for service-connected disabled veterans. The bill as originally introduced would have permitted a 60-day grace period before any reduction in aid and attendance for the totally disabled and provide an increase in the presumptive period for multiple sclerosis from 3 to 7 years. The bill was passed by the House and referred to the Senate.

SENATE CUTS BILL

Winding up ultimately in the Senate Finance Committee, the bill was amended by decreasing compensation benefits for the 10, 20, and 30 percent disabled veterans. It was amended to delete the section which would have extended the presumptive period for those afflicted with multiple sclerosis and a rider was attached by Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana, which would open national service life insurance for a period of 2 years. The bill as amended was passed by the Senate and referred back to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Any move to reopen national service life insurance is unacceptable by both the committee and the administration. Because of this opposition, the bill will probably remain on the Speaker's table and will not be called up. Mr. TEAGUE made a personal appeal on the measure to all representatives. The committee also met in executive session and voted to table all veterans insurance legislation until the next session of Congress.

NSLI FOR THOSE OVER 65

About the same time, the Veterans' Affairs Committee favorably reported to the House H.R. 856 which was merely a bill which would modify the national service life insurance to make it easier for veterans aged 65 or over to continue an insurance program. This bill was passed by the House and referred to the Senate Finance Committee. There it was amended to include the provisions of H.R. 879 concerning compensation increases, but again the Long amendment opening national service life insurance was appended. We have just learned from Dixon Christian of the Virginia chapter that if the bill is introduced on the floor of the Senate,

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON intends to introduce a motion to remove that part of the bill referring to national service life insurance. If this move is successful, the bill will be acceptable to the House and may yet pass Congress during this session.

Does the Washington Post Report the News?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I am constantly told that the Washington Post is a great newspaper. To my mind, a great newspaper reports news truthfully. A report which appeared in the September 18, 1961, issue of the Washington Post concerning the meeting scheduled for September 17, 1961, between Katanga's Moise Tshombe and Dag Hammarskjöld, which never occurred, causes me to wonder if the Post does make a real effort to report news truthfully. I am sure other Members of Congress will be interested in the report. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

U.N. CHIEF, TSHOMBE IN CONFERENCE—FIGHTING REPORTED CONTINUING AS TWO TALK IN RHODESIA

U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld was reported discussing a Congo cease-fire with Katanga President Moise Tshombe yesterday.

They conferred for more than an hour at Ndola in Northern Rhodesia and then drove to Kitwe, 30 miles northwest of the city, for what informants said would be the crucial phase of the talks, the Associated Press reported.

As the two discussed extension of a truce the U.N. reported it achieved in Jadotville on Saturday, there were conflicting reports on the military situation in Katanga where U.N. and Katanganese forces have been fighting since Wednesday.

GARRISON SURRENDER REPORTED

The Katanga Government claimed the 150-man garrison at Jadotville had surrendered. Reuters reported in a dispatch from Elisabethville. The garrison was reported being held hostage.

Reuters also reported that fighting had broken out again at Elisabethville and that a Katanganese plane had bombed the U.N.-controlled airport there.

Tshombe, who has vowed to fight the United Nations action to the death, flew to Ndola from Kipushi, accompanied by Denzil Dunnett, British consul at Elisabethville, the Associated Press reported. His plane was escorted by Rhodesian Air Force bombers.

Tshombe was met at the Ndola Airport by Lord Alport, British High Commissioner for the Rhodesian Federation, United Press International reported.

TSHOMBE WAITS

Tshombe and Alport waited for Hammarskjöld for 4½ hours in the airport control tower, which was under strict security guard.

Hammarskjöld flew to Ndola from Leopoldville in a chartered DC-3. He was seeking at least a temporary peace in the breakaway

Congo Province that fought so bitterly to keep its 15-month "independence."

After talks at the airport the leaders drove to Kitwe for further discussions at a residence known as the Queen's House. As the motorcade left, Rhodesian police blocked all roads from the airport, preventing reporters from following.

The conference came in the fifth day of warfare set off by U.N. efforts to force the mineral-rich province back under the rule of the Central Government in Leopoldville.

Hammarskjöld, who had been on his third visit to the Congo, took a personal hand.

But even as hopes rose for a general cease-fire in Katanga there were reports that the U.N. garrison at Jadotville had been "overwhelmed."

MESSAGE FROM M'KEON

The Irish Government Information Center in Dublin reported it had received a cable from U.N. headquarters in Leopoldville saying fighting had broken out again between Irish and Katanganese troops at Jadotville, United Press International reported.

The cable said the 155-man garrison had been "overwhelmed by drastically superior numbers." The message came from Gen. Sean McKeon, Irish U.N. military commander in the Congo.

Earlier reports from Jadotville said Irish and Katanganese troops, who were locked in battle for 4 days, were patrolling the area side by side. It was at Jadotville that the U.N. claimed a cease-fire Saturday and that Katanga forces had revolted against their white officers and fraternized with the U.N. soldiers.

At Elisabethville, U.N. armored cars were patrolling the streets and sporadic fighting was going on, Reuters reported. A dispatch from Frederick Ungehur said U.N. headquarters in the capital were being desperately defended following a heavy Katanganese mortar attack.

A French-made Katanga Fouga jet bombed the Elisabethville Airport. No casualties were reported but a U.N. DC-3 was hit, Reuters said.

KAMINA IS BATTLE CENTER

A U.N. DC-4 troop-carrying plane was reported shot down in Albertville, the Reuters dispatch said. The report from Katanganese sources said the plane was attempting to fly men to the Kamina base in Katanga. It also said several other U.N. planes on similar missions were forced to return to Luluaborg in Kivu Province.

Heavy fighting was reported at Kamina. A U.N. spokesman said the garrison at the huge base had withdrawn into a smaller perimeter. The spokesman said no troops had been withdrawn.

The Associated Press reported that fighting persisted for control of Kamina.

In Elisabethville, some 8,000 whites offered prayers for the end of fighting. They have been trapped in Elisabethville since Wednesday, and food supplies for civilians have reached dangerously low levels. Residents lined up for bread and milk.

Voters Should Learn Candidates' Views Before—Not After—Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a letter which went out to in-

quiring and complaining constituents who protested excessive taxes follows:

A TIMID SUGGESTION

When candidates seek office, make them tell you before you vote, just where they stand and their reasons therefor on questions in which you are personally interested, on issues which affect the national welfare.

ON THE ROAD TO RUIN

On August 16, 1961, from the well of the House, Mr. CANNON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, a Democrat from Missouri, said: "We are spending, and we have been spending during this entire year, every hour, \$1 million more than we are taking in. Ever since this session began we have been spending in the red at the rate of \$1 million every hour, day and night."

Inasmuch as the Congress continues to make appropriations calling for money which we do not have and can borrow only at an ever increasing rate of interest, thought you might be interested in the above.

Ruinous spending is one reason why my vote is so often not on desirable, but, when war threatens, unnecessary legislation.

Sincerely,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Genuine Cooperation Will Be Most Difficult

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the tragic passing of the sincere and highly respected Secretary General of the U.N. makes all future negotiations more difficult. Considered fair and impartial by all but the Soviets—two words they do not recognize—they will undoubtedly attempt to block confirmation of any one with similar qualifications.

An editorial appearing in a recent issue of the York (Pa.) Dispatch outlines pretty clearly the philosophy of the Godless leaders of communism and why in the days ahead the United Nations stands at the crossroads:

"DRY WATER, WOODEN IRON"

Partners in any enterprise must be perfectly frank with one another. They must not lie, they must not cheat. They must cooperate.

In short, partners must have the same set of human values.

This is true whether applied to marriage, business or international relations.

Our difficulties with Russia today stem not from a clash of political or military interests, but from a clash of values.

In the United States, government has been instituted by the people to protect their welfare in accordance with the God-given dignity of man. In the Soviet Union, government was instituted by a group of revolutionaries who deny God and consider man a vassal and a tool of the state.

If man has no rights, then life under the Communist state becomes the survival of the fittest. This accounts for the political purges not only in Russia, but in other Communist-run nations. Such a philosophy of life carries over in Red bloc relations with other countries.

Communists intend to win the world. Their philosophy of life does not provide for cooperation with other men, but for the conquest of other men.

That is why life is so difficult today. Where Communists are weak, they maneuver for position and power. Where they are strong, they bully and bluster. Never do they lose sight of their goal: The overthrow of all other existing social conditions.

The solution? We do not profess to know. One vital fact is apparent, however. The free world must be prepared to defend its philosophy of life by force of arms if necessary.

And we must be extremely wary of diplomatic dealings with the Kremlin. For it is the Communist's view, voiced by Josef Stalin, that "sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron."

Only a sense of values can make diplomacy sincere. When the Reds come to value truth and justice, peace will reign.

American Enterprise Leads the Way to Progress and Freedom

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, because of my committee responsibilities as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and previously as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I have had the responsibility during the past several years to visit a number of foreign countries and observe firsthand the existence of military, economic, and governmental affairs in those countries. These trips have given added conviction to my belief that America's greatest contribution to international friendship and understanding stems primarily from the activities of American private enterprise operating throughout the world. Our governmental endeavors on the international scale are important in terms of governmental relationships but are not as influential as private enterprise activities in improving human living conditions, strengthening the cause of liberty, and advancing American objectives toward peaceful progress shared by all.

This importance of private enterprise in the global scheme of things is one of the reasons why I was so concerned over the administration's tax recommendations made earlier this year to impose more stringent tax restrictions on the endeavors of American free enterprise to participate competitively in international trade. I believe that the Congress has acted wisely in laying aside these administration recommendations that would impair the ability of our free enterprise system to operate effectively as America's best good-will ambassador in foreign countries.

One of America's outstanding industrial statesmen, Mr. Morse G. Dial, chairman of the board of Union Carbide Corp., wrote an article which was published in the September 12, 1961 New

York Herald Tribune which was captioned "Private 'Foreign Aid'." Mr. Dial very eloquently describes the way in which American industry has been working to enhance American prestige and influence throughout the world by improving the well-being of mankind while at the same time strengthening America's industrial capacity.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly interested in Mr. Dial's excellent column because the Union Carbide Corp. is an important employer in my congressional district. This excellent American enterprise maintains a plant at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. I know firsthand the excellent community record that Union Carbide has as an employer and as a corporate citizen of my home community. The Union Carbide Corp. recently joined with the citizens of Sault Ste. Marie to observe an anniversary of more than 60 years of a carbide facility operation in Sault Ste. Marie.

I would like to commend Mr. Dial for the very perceptive understanding that he has evidenced in his column of our free-enterprise system and its proper role in world affairs. I will at this point include Mr. Dial's article as a part of my remarks. I will also include an editorial from the Sault Ste. Marie Evening News commemorating the carbide anniversary to which I referred. These two newspaper articles demonstrate the outstanding contribution that the Union Carbide Corp. is making to progress at home and abroad as well as to freedom for mankind everywhere:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 15, 1961]

PRIVATE "FOREIGN AID"
(By Morse G. Dial)

Early this year, Mr. Manubhai Shah, India's Minister for Industry, inaugurated a new Indo-American chemicals and plastics plant near Bombay. He took the occasion to say: "I would like to welcome all the countries of the world and all the technology they have developed to come and help us in this great endeavor of industrializing this vast country of ours."

These remarks point up an aspect of our country's "foreign aid" that perhaps has not been given the attention it deserves. I am referring, of course, to the exporting by American industry of its technical know-how.

This is enabling some of the lesser developed countries abroad to benefit from the cumulative knowledge and experience gained by American companies over many years.

The particular Indo-American enterprise that the Indian official was helping to launch is a good illustration of the extent of our technological collaboration.

The new plant was built by an Indian company in which Union Carbide Corp. with which I am associated, has a substantial investment.

The plant is based essentially on process information and equipment designs that evolved from research laboratories and operating experience here in this country.

Indian engineers came to the United States to work with their American counterparts on the plant design, to make sure that insofar as possible the new plant would be suited to the conditions under which it would operate in India.

These engineers also received a broad basic training in chemicals and plastics plants op-

erated by Union Carbide in the United States and Canada.

Finally, an experienced group of engineers and operators drawn from Union Carbide plants in the United States was sent to India to guide newly recruited Indian operating personnel during the startup phases.

The operation of an integrated chemicals and plastics plant of this type is highly complex since it involves extremes of heat, cold, vacuum, and pressures. It takes not only considerable knowledge and skill, but also the caution born of an awareness of what could result if a slip occurred.

The increasing participation of American companies in overseas chemicals production can be attributed to several factors.

In the first place, many businessmen in this country have come to accept the fact that they must take a global approach if they expect to face up to today's challenges.

Also, what to do to help underdeveloped nations modernize their economies and raise their standard of living can profoundly affect the outcome of the political conflicts brewing throughout the world.

The fundamental incentive for American business is, of course, the size and growth potential of the international market. In 1959, the total value of the chemicals produced throughout the world outside of the United States was about \$40 billion—about a third more than our domestic market.

In the years immediately following World War II, many American chemical companies were shipping a significant proportion of their output overseas.

However, as overseas markets expanded, foreign companies and investors entered the field and undertook local production of chemicals that were previously imported.

Now, competitive and restrictive factors abroad make it almost impossible for an American exporter to compete with an internal producer overseas at least as far as many of the major commodity-type chemicals are concerned.

Naturally, American industry would like to continue to share in the growth of the world chemical industry, and to see foreign business contribute in a reasonable way to overall company profits.

Consequently, a number of American companies have been building chemical plants overseas either by themselves, in partnership with well-established local companies, or through affiliated companies in which the American company has a significant interest but with a widespread public ownership of stock as well.

For instance, Union Carbide recently extended its polyethylene manufacturing interests to Japan and Sweden by establishing partnerships with substantial local companies in these countries.

Current investment abroad by American companies is estimated to be more than \$1.5 billion. Aside from the substantial monetary return, there is the incalculable return that results from this opportunity to demonstrate to countries abroad some of the benefits of our free enterprise system.

[From the Sault Ste. Marie (Mich.) Evening News, Sept. 15, 1961]
CARBIDE RECOGNITION

Carbide Recognition Day, an event long overdue in the Sault Ste. Marie area, serves to focus the thinking of the area on two members of long standing in the community.

The present and predecessor plants of Union Carbide Olefins Co. and Carbide Power Co. have stood since the turn of the century as a landmark on the skyline of Sault Ste. Marie. The fortunes of calcium carbide and the community have been intertwined through the years; the horseless carriage's gaslight and miner's lamp gave way to the increased industrial use of acetylene gas and finally to its rise as an important building block in the mushrooming chemical industry.

A concentration on the world of tomorrow has made Union Carbide a world leader. From its small and relatively simple beginnings in the pioneer plants like Sault Ste. Marie, it has grown into a progressive major American enterprise known the world over.

This tribute to forward-looking management is only part of the story. The Sault Ste. Marie has long known firsthand of the advanced policies of Union Carbide Co., toward the men and women who are members of its production teams. Every 2 years, the savings plan is announced, and its participants share in the fruits of this unusual arrangement. Extended vacations for long-service employees have long been in effect and others are only now beginning to gain this social benefit. The safety programs for the benefit of its employees have always been outstanding. These are but a few examples.

Most important of all, Carbide people have always been intimately associated with the broad spectrum of community life. The entire roster of the two plants represents friends and neighbors who share in the community's hopes and aspirations, contribute to its social, governmental, economic and religious life. They raise their children, maintain their homes, and devote their working lives to the production of this vital basic product.

For some, Carbide has become a father and son tradition. Because of its fruitful early association with Union Carbide Co. in its fledgling years, men who spent their youth or some of their years on the banks of the St. Mary's River have gone on to greater places within the ranks of Union Carbide. Their old friends who have stayed behind speak with pride of their contributions and accomplishments.

It is with a sense of deep and abiding appreciation that the people of Sault Ste. Marie and surrounding area pause on the eve of September 16 to pay tribute to these industrial good neighbors, Carbide Power Co. and Union Carbide Olefins Co. In a way, the occasion is a salute to the past vision which brought calcium carbide through its initial pioneering pains to its present status in the chemical world; but at the same time, it is a community's best wishes for continued progress in the search for the world of tomorrow in "the exciting universe of Union Carbide."

National Poison Prevention Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the Senate has passed House Joint Resolution 358, which was approved by this House on September 6. Inasmuch as this resolution, authorizing the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the third week in March as "National Poison Prevention Week," has the approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as indicated in a letter from Secretary Abraham Ribicoff to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, it is anticipated that the resolution will very shortly receive the approval of President Kennedy.

The importance of this resolution is indicated in the letter to Chairman CELLER by Secretary Ribicoff, who in noting the large number of cases of accidental poisoning, particularly of children, stated:

Almost all of these could have been prevented. We believe that the designation of a National Poison Prevention Week with the concentration of attention from the press, radio, television, and other media will bring some of these precautions to the attention of the public and will result in an appreciable reduction of accidental poisonings.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that a resident of the 10th Congressional District of Missouri was responsible for the inception of the idea of a National Poison Prevention Week, and that Missouri was the first of several States to recognize the great good that can come from the designation of a week in which attention can be centered on the hazard that exists and the means which can be taken in saving lives.

To Mr. Homer George, a small city pharmacist, who operates two prescription pharmacies in Cape Girardeau, Mo., should go most of the credit for this worthwhile movement. It was he who recognized not only the problem, and set about to do something about, first the treatment, but more important, the prevention of unnecessary poisoning. More than any other one individual, Mr. George has been responsible for the establishment of poison control centers in hundreds of hospitals throughout the United States. Generously, contributing both his time and his own money, he has appeared before conventions and other meetings throughout the length and breadth of this land, calling attention to the great dangers, and counseling as to how best to meet the problem, both through prompt treatment, and also through prevention. In this effort, he has had the wholehearted cooperation of the American Pharmaceutical Association and the American College of Apothecaries, which have applauded his efforts through the adoption of resolutions, both in State and national conventions, endorsing the establishment of a National Poison Prevention Week.

It was almost 3 years ago that Mr. George convinced me of the desirability of Congress taking cognizance of this problem, and at the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced a resolution which would have requested the President to designate such a week. For three successive Congresses I have endeavored to secure approval of such a resolution and it was only this year that our efforts have been successful.

There are still many people who will regard this effort as an idle gesture and will presume that National Poison Prevention Week is just another of many designations of certain days or weeks that have no particular importance. However, I am predicting that with the information that will be disseminated during the third week of March next year that we will begin to see the great good that can come from this action of Congress. I believe most sincerely that with the passing of the years those who have had only a small part in this effort will appreciate and be proud of the co-

operation which they gave to the passage of House Joint Resolution 358.

In tracing the development of this idea, I am presenting herewith an article, prepared by Mr. Homer George, which appeared in the March 1960 issue of the *Journal of the American Pharmaceutical Association* which gives the history and background of National Poison Prevention Week, up until that time. It does not, of course, mention the failure to secure passage of the resolution introduced last year, nor does it mention House Joint Resolution 358, which has now been approved by Congress.

POISON PREVENTION WEEK
(By Homer A. George)

Countless deaths have occurred annually due to accidental, suicidal, and industrial poisonings. Many of these deaths could have been prevented had certain individuals recognized the inherent dangers of some of our common household items or if there had been adequate information and treatment readily available. There has been a great deal of activity recently in establishing poison control and treatment centers and the author as chairman of the special committee of the American College of Apothecaries has been responsible for the establishment of various centers. However, the problem is not primarily one of treatment but—of more importance—one of prevention.

If the public could be alerted to the fact that many cases of poisoning could be prevented by the simple expediency of practicing a few definite precautionary measures, the problem of treatment would be greatly reduced.

The public must be educated in "poison prevention." Last year nearly a million people were poisoned accidentally. Each day about 1,000 children under the age of 3 years are poisoned accidentally and the public apparently is quite indifferent to the problem. It is amazing how unaware the public is of the dangers of accidental poisoning in the home.

There have been isolated efforts by pharmacists to reprint various antidote charts and distribute them to the public, but this approach does not reach enough people. I felt that there must be some way to alert the public in a more definitive manner. The cost of any extensive program would be high and I tried to figure who would benefit the most from the type of educational program that had to be launched. Finally deciding that next to the poison victims and their families the insurance companies should be the most concerned, I contacted the president of the Cape Girardeau County (Missouri) Association of Insurance Agents and explained the problem. An invitation to address the group was forthcoming and a program of parental education was outlined. The need for presentations before all types of civic service and religious groups was indicated and it was proposed that this might be centered around the establishment of a "Poison Prevention Week."

The following day, I visited the mayor and told him that there was a National Pickle Week and a National Mother-In-Law Week and as far as I knew neither had ever killed anyone, but poisons were going at it every day and indicated a real need for a Poison Prevention Week. He was most impressed and proclaimed the week of October 12-18 1958 as "Poison Prevention Week." The following is the text of the resolution:

"Whereas, it seems needful that all of the people of our community become thoroughly acquainted with the dangers of careless handling of poisons, and whereas, there were

1,000,000 persons poisoned in the United States last year, and each day 1,000 children under the age of two years were poisoned by their parents, through careless handling and storage of medicines, insecticides, and chemicals, and whereas, there exists a great need for the education of parents to prevent such poisonings, by keeping out of the reach of children all household preparations, coal oil, furniture polish, etc., rat, fly and roach sprays, cosmetics, medicines of all kinds, especially aspirin; now, therefore, I, Walter H. Ford, Mayor of the City of Cape Girardeau, Mo., do set aside the week of October 12 to October 18, 1958, inclusive, as Poison Prevention Week, and I call upon all citizens to assist in every way possible to become educated to prevent such dangers."

A copy of this was sent to the Governor of Missouri requesting him to make a similar proclamation. In a very short time a document was received, seal and all, and Gov. James T. Blair of the State of Missouri became the first Governor in the United States to declare a statewide Poison Prevention Week. The proclamation was almost identical to that of the mayor's.

Enthusiastic with the success achieved, I wondered just how far this could go and so a letter was sent to President Eisenhower. Four days later a reply was received from Frederick Fox, special assistant to the White House, commending this worthwhile endeavor. He explained, however, that such a national proclamation would require an act of Congress and suggested that our sales representatives be contacted. I was about 10 days ahead of him and had already spoken with Congressman PAUL JONES, of Missouri, who had agreed to present a bill at the 1st session of the 86th Congress. This bill was introduced in January, 1959, given the number House Joint Resolution 57 and assigned to a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

The American College of Apothecaries at its annual convention in May 1959, APA at its annual convention in August 1959, and many State pharmaceutical associations adopted resolutions urging passage of this bill. Many individual pharmacists, manufacturers, and the public indicated their approval of the measure by letters to their Congressmen. I was privileged to appear on the NBC nationally televised "Today" program and discuss the concepts of poison prevention and the intent of the bill with Arlene Francis. The bill was unanimously reported out favorably by the House subcommittee but the full Committee on the Judiciary tabled it on August 25, 1959. A new bill—House Joint Resolution 592—was introduced by Congressman JONES on February 1, 1960, at this 2d session of the 86th Congress and it is hoped that with proper interest displayed by various public health groups that it will be adopted. Although the original bill called for the second week in October, it was felt that a week early in spring would be more desirable. Therefore, House Joint Resolution 592 has deleted specific recommendations on the week to be so designated. The complete bill reads as follows:

"H.J. RES. 592, 86TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

"Whereas almost 500,000 persons are accidentally poisoned in the United States annually; and

"Whereas daily almost 1,000 children under the age of 5 years are accidentally poisoned by consuming household products containing harmful chemicals; and

"Whereas household products sometimes are not adequately marked so as to warn of their poisonous properties with the result that they sometimes are not stored out of the reach of children; and

"Whereas there is a great need for the education of the American people as to the dangers of accidental poisonings and of the need to keep from the reach of children all household products which contain harmful chemicals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the — week in — as National Poison Prevention Week, to aid in encouraging the American people to learn of the dangers of accidental poisoning and to take such preventive measures as are warranted by the seriousness of the danger."

A proclamation is useless if it doesn't bring results. It is hoped that National Poison Prevention Week will focus attention on this most serious problem and that it will aid in eliminating this tremendously wasteful loss of human life. The pharmacist can be most helpful in publicizing this problem.

Following our local proclamation we attempted to create public interest. Window streamers were designed and distributed by our local auxiliary police. These were displayed in every store in town. The proclamations and ads were published in the local newspapers. Spot ads were placed on local TV and radio stations making the public aware of Poison Prevention Week.

Two days before the opening of the campaign, I was allotted 25 minutes on our local TV station to explain the dangers of and methods of preventing accidental poisoning in the home. The station had partial coverage of a five-State area and a receiving audience of more than 1 million and we felt the message was getting across.

These efforts have been continued and presentations have been made to more than 50 groups in at least 15 States. In addition, with the cooperation of the American College of Apothecaries, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. was contacted and arrangements were made to distribute, through pharmacies, an excellent pamphlet entitled "Caution, Babies Learning." Many hundreds of pharmacies availed themselves of the opportunity to distribute these and we estimate that several millions of people were reached with the message.

However, the surface has just been scratched and the cooperation of each and every pharmacist is needed if the full potential of the public health value of this effort can be realized. Each pharmacist should contact his legislator and urge adoption of the bill proclaiming a National Poison Prevention Week. In addition active programs of public education should be initiated by the pharmacist. Such efforts will most certainly result in providing the community a tremendous public health service and should afford the pharmacist a great deal of self-satisfaction.

(Currently the operator of two prescription pharmacies in Cape Girardeau, Mo., Homer A. George has had a long career in pharmacy. He began working in a retail pharmacy when he was 11 years old and entered the St. Louis College of Pharmacy in 1926, becoming a registered pharmacist in 1929. The year 1936 saw the opening of his first prescription pharmacy in Cape Girardeau, a small city on the banks of the Mississippi. In 1949, after just 10 weeks of operation, his second pharmacy was leveled by a tornado and had to be rebuilt. Following in his footsteps, one of George's sons is a registered pharmacist and the other is attending the St. Louis College of Pharmacy. George is a regional assistant director of the American College of Apothecaries.)

President of University of Dallas Warns of Communist Infiltration of Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, American colleges and universities are among the prime targets for Communist infiltration. Our greatest weapon against this subversion is renewed faith in our own system of free enterprise, our pride in old-fashioned Americanism. Nowhere has this been said better than on the "Manion Forum" recently by the president of the University of Dallas, Dr. Robert Morris. The transcript of this fine broadcast follows:

Dean MANION. How serious is Communist infiltration of American education? At the annual meeting of the Harvard University Alumni Association on last commencement day (June 15), Harvard president, Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, read a recent letter from a Harvard alumnus criticizing the university for promoting measures "leading to totalitarianism."

President Pusey then called upon all Harvard alumni to help him answer this kind of criticism. Some of the Harvard graduates who responded sent copies of their suggestions to me. How can Harvard or any other American university meet the fairly common charge that it is teaching economic and political doctrines that are subversive of time-honored American principles?

One of these Harvard correspondents suggests that, as a first step, all university presidents should courageously weed out of the faculty those teachers who make a habit of ridiculing people who attack communism. He thus advises university administrators to be on the alert for the anti-anticommunism that Senator STROM THURMOND told us about over this microphone 2 weeks ago (Manion Forum broadcast No. 361). This is not the complete answer, of course, but it is good advice nevertheless.

For many years, communism, internal and external communism, has been a clear, present and constantly increasing menace to the United States. Here and all over the world communism centers its attack upon educational institutions.

Many university administrators have failed to recognize that obvious fact and Communists have used the facilities of those universities to brainwash thousands of Americans into the fatal conviction that communism, at its worst, is a harmless political philosophy and, at its best, a hopeful promise for the peace and security of mankind.

In our presently precarious deadlock with communism it ought to be fairly obvious that American university presidents must thoroughly understand the vast dimensions of the Red conspiracy, as a prerequisite to the patriotic execution of their important responsibilities.

My guest at this microphone now, Dr. Robert Morris, president of the flourishing University of Dallas, acquired his understanding of the Communist conspiracy during the years when he was investigating Communist subversion as chief counsel for the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate.

For the exciting and frightening documentation of that experience, I refer you to his book "No Wonder We Are Losing" (Book-mall \$2.50, Box 101, New York City 16, N.Y.). But now, let me refer you to him. Dr. Morris, are you enjoying your new re-

sponsibility as president of the University of Dallas?

Dr. MORRIS: Yes, I am, Dean Manion. Being president of an academic institution, at a time of great crisis for our country, is a real challenge, and I think that this is a challenge that I am trying to live up to.

Dean MANION. Doctor, I am sure you will agree that the best antidote for the poison of communism is a firm and friendly understanding of Americanism. Are you convinced that, generally speaking, our institutions of higher learning are doing all that they can or ought to do to develop an adequate understanding of Americanism?

Dr. MORRIS. My answer to that, Dean Manion, would be no. My feelings are basically these: Americanism, and by that term, and with that term, I equate patriotism, is an important virtue and a great national and international asset. I identify with this term, Americanism, all the wonderful things that the United States of America stand for—freedom, liberty, and all their glorious corollaries.

Our Constitution with its wonderful balance of powers, its Bill of Rights—these are tremendous assets. In fact, this Americanism, describing it as I am here today, is a great treasure box, the envy of men of all lands and of all history. We should prize these blessings so much that we should take the position that we would like these extended to men of all lands.

Now, I find, Dean Manion, in many academic institutions and generally throughout the land, an ascendant force. This force is a powerful one. You can find it in many parts of the land. It is entrenched in many of our educational institutions. This force would extinguish Americanism and all that it stands for and substitute instead a shabby, dreary variation of socialism that would gradually strip us of our incentive and, after that, our liberty and freedom. This force is also causing us to rely not on our tremendous resources, our national strength, our wonderful institutions, but rather on growing international agencies. Now, it is ironical that these international agencies, even though they are supposed to provide us security, are giving us no security at all. What they are doing is simply depriving us of the freedom of movement, the freedom of decision that is necessary to ward off a very, very aggressive dictatorial type of movement—the Soviet international movement.

WORLD INFLUENCE OF COMMUNISM RAPIDLY DEFEATING AMERICANISM

It is also ironical that the more these same institutions, these international agencies are taken over by the forces of slavery, and that is what Khrushchev's forces are, the more we are entrusting our power and our responsibility to them. This is one of the great ironies of our times.

Therefore, Dean Manion, my answer to you is this: American institutions, American educational institutions, are not recognizing the heart of the problem that confronts us. By casting aside and minimizing Americanism, patriotism and the strength of the United States of America, they are actually enervating us and making it easier for these brutalizing forces to extinguish our liberty.

Dean MANION. What are you doing at the University of Dallas to correct this situation?

Dr. MORRIS. Dean Manion, we are trying to educate the young men and the young women who come to our university in the fundamentals of education. We feel that education should provide not only skills, learning, not only an understanding of history and all the sciences, but an implementation to all these things that will enable the beneficiary of this type of education to live in the world of the 1960's.

If education cannot be translated into the actualities of our times, then we feel that we are not being successful in our various programs. Accordingly, we are stressing the

fundamentals, the history of Western civilization.

Strong courses in American history, courses in the study of the Constitution of the United States and all our political institutions; courses, naturally, in all the natural sciences, and in all those aspects of education that are really essential if anyone is going on to specialization in the various fields of endeavor.

But, at all times, we are very mindful of the fact that the young men and women at the University of Dallas, in a few years, will be the leaders of tomorrow. And, unless they understand the brutalizing forces in our society today, unless they comprehend them, unless they comprehend the nature of the great threat of our times, they will only be supernumeraries in the great challenge that the life ahead offers.

For all these reasons, Dean Manion, we are trying to be fundamental, and we are trying to inculcate and instill the realities of our times.

Dean MANION. Dr. Morris, let us get away from institutional education for the moment. I observe that you continue to do a lot of good speaking on the subject of communism and American foreign policy. Are you satisfied now with the response that our country is making to the Communist challenge?

Dr. MORRIS. Well, Dean Manion, I am certainly not satisfied. I think that we are losing our heritage—our wonderful heritage is slipping away from us and that we, as a Nation, are not responding.

HOW CAN WE SAVE FREEDOM BY PROMOTING COMMUNISM?

My solution would be simply this: Let us stop aiding communism all over the land. Now, this may strike you as a curious approach, but the history of the last 15 years will incontrovertibly demonstrate that we have been creating communism throughout the world.

I was the counsel to the Senate committee that made the damage survey in China. We created Chinese communism—that was created here in the United States. We created Fidel Castro. Today we are creating communism in the Congo.

There a coalition government, fabricated by the United Nations and ourselves, is now gradually taking over the treasure box of Africa. We are today, in our foreign aid, giving money to many Communist countries. Guinea is a Communist country. We are financing them even though they are building a naval base and Soviet Mig strips.

We are aiding communism in Yugoslavia, in Poland, and in many other countries of the world. I think that for the first year—the next year or so—the great advantage would accrue to us if we once stopped aiding and financing communism around the world.

The second solution would be for us to eliminate from their entrenched positions in all the bureaus of Washington those specialists who, for the last 10 or 15 years, have been devising one program after another leading to surrender, concession, and retreat.

I think that any kind of a damage survey, taken over the last 15 years, would indicate that these people, these bureaucrats, have been conducting a foreign policy that is the complete antithesis of the lofty expressions of our Presidents and the lofty sentiments of our elected Representatives in the Senate and the House.

Our policy seems fine when you read it, certainly it seems wonderful during campaign time, but then when you come around to implementation, you find people doing exactly the opposite to what the lofty professions promised.

I think that, if you have these two things, Dean Manion, have them both in mind—one, stop aiding communism; two, get a new cast of characters in Washington to implement the various policies, and then, if you can

summarize the thing, try to take the essence of our wonderful political institutions and offer them rather than the gross materialism that we are offering now the people in all lands. They will gravitate to us as steel gravitates to a magnet. This is what the world thirsts for and, yet, we are not striking this posture.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Dr. Robert Morris, president of the University of Dallas. I hope that every college president in America will soon receive a copy of what you have just said. Meanwhile, the best of everything to you in your new assignment and a patriotic salute to the University of Dallas.

Machrowicz Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to submit for the Record the following article by J. F. Ter Hortst, which appeared in the September 17, 1961, issue of the Detroit News about the successful career of our esteemed colleague, Thaddeus Machrowicz, who has resigned to accept an appointment as a Federal judge.

While I want to take the occasion to publicly wish my good friend the best of luck and a long and successful term in his new office, I want also to cite this story as a typical example of what an individual can accomplish in a free Nation and a free society such as we enjoy in this great land of ours.

The article follows:

MACHROWICZ SUCCESS STORY—FROM POLAND TO U.S. BENCH

(By J. F. Ter Hortst)

WASHINGTON, September 16.—The Senator from Colorado looked at the immigrant from Poland and remarked:

"It took three generations before President Kennedy reached the top. It has taken you only one."

The lawmaker was Senator CARROLL, Democratic member of the Judiciary Committee. The American by choice was Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Democratic Congressman from Hamtramck. The occasion was the hearing to confirm Mr. Kennedy's choice of Machrowicz for a lifetime Federal judgeship in Detroit.

WINS APPROVAL

Less than 90 minutes later, on the motion of Senator THOMAS D. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, Machrowicz' appointment whisked through the Senate. For the first time in 20 years, a U.S. Representative has become a Federal district judge.

For this, the lifelong goal of "Thad" Machrowicz and the dream of almost every lawyer, the six-term Congressman is resigning from the House of Representatives on Monday.

He had, by any reckoning, come a long way from Gostyn, Poland.

"It's strange," Machrowicz mused, "the way life takes its turns. As much as I hoped it would come through, I'm going to miss this place."

The place is not Washington, but the Capitol Building. In the 11 years, Machrowicz rose to a senior on the Ways and

Means Committee, which writes the Nation's tax laws.

DOOR WAS OPEN

His office door was open to friend and foe, his words were frank and blunt and his courtesy was Old World. Newcomers to Congress found him a haven of good counsel. Reporters found him a valuable guide to what was going on.

He was a Midwest Democrat whip for Speaker RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas. In turn, he had access to RAYBURN's inner sanctum. He was, as one close colleague put it, "a liberal with both feet on the floor."

Machrowicz' journey from Poland to Congress to court is not a miracle. But it could happen, as author Harry Golden might say, "Only in America."

The new judge was 2 years old when his mother gathered the family to follow her refugee husband, Boniface, to a new life in the United States in 1901. Machrowicz father, a jeweler, had made the mistake of nurturing Polish nationalism in a part of Poland then under the rule of the German empire.

MOVED TO CHICAGO

The family moved first in Chicago, then Milwaukee, then back to Chicago. At 12, Thad acquired U.S. citizenship with his father's naturalization. The elder Machrowicz, still a fighter for Polish causes, sent his son to Alliance Academy in Cambridge Springs, Pa., where the language was taught.

In 1917, Machrowicz entered the University of Chicago. But his mind was not on books. The war was raging in Europe and the old ties tugged. He enlisted at 16 in the Polish army of American volunteers and went overseas to fight.

Among other things, the teenage second lieutenant was one of the first Yanks to battle the Communists. It was the historic gates of Warsaw battle, one of the 10 most decisive battles in Polish history. And the Reds lost.

WORKS FOR POLAND

After the war, the young American joined the American technical advisory committee to the Polish Government, serving as interpreter, liaison officer, and adviser. He might have stayed on, but the fatal illness of his mother drew him back to Chicago in 1921.

Then came a good piece of fortune for the big Polish community in Hamtramck and Detroit's East Side. The Polish Government decided to open a consulate in Detroit in 1923. It seemed natural to ask Machrowicz, then 24, to join the staff.

By 1924, Machrowicz had obtained a law degree from the Detroit College of Law. He left the consulate's employ and became secretary to the mayor of Hamtramck.

By 1928 he was in love with government and an accomplished pianist named Sophia Jara. He made his first bid for political office as Republican candidate for State representative and lost by two votes.

NAMED CITY ATTORNEY

After that, Machrowicz concentrated on building up a legal practice. But he could not forget politics or Miss Jara. In 1934 he was appointed Hamtramck city attorney. In 1935 they were married. In 1938, as a reward for working in the Democratic campaign of Gov. Frank Murphy, Machrowicz was appointed legal director for the Michigan Public Utilities Commission at Lansing.

Two years later he resigned to run as a Democratic candidate for the State senate. He lost again. Undaunted he ran a few months later for the municipal judgeship in Hamtramck. This time he made it, and for two successive terms after that.

For all he knows, Machrowicz might still be a Hamtramck jurist except that former Representative George Sadowski, a 14-year veteran in the First District, made the mis-

take of daring him to run for the seat in 1950.

CANNOT STAND DARES

"I can't stand dares," Machrowicz said. "So I took him on."

The issue was communism and its inroads into Hamtramck's Polish community. Machrowicz spoke wherever he could find two or three gathered together, lambasting Sadowski for his hand-off attitude.

Sadowski looked like an easy winner in the primary. But the Korean war broke out. When the tallies were counted, Machrowicz was in by 178 votes.

Two years later, he snuffed a Sadowski comeback attempt by a 2 to 1 margin. In the years since, no one has ever come close.

But in all those years, Machrowicz never lost his love for the bench.

WANTED TO TEACH

"I once wanted to be a schoolteacher," he said. "I liked the law even better. There was great satisfaction in being municipal judge. Even here, where the years have been good to me, I found myself wishing."

Machrowicz had been boomed for a court appointment during the Eisenhower administration, but the White House had a policy of selecting no one from Congress. Mr. Kennedy had no such qualms.

So Detroit's new Federal judge takes up his duties October 2. There will be a swearing-in ceremony. Machrowicz will need a robe but not a gavel. The rest of the Michigan delegation here, Republicans and Democrats, gave him one the other day. A token of their esteem.

Air Pollution Control Association Calls for a National Conference on Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution recently adopted by the Air Pollution Control Association calling for a National Conference on Air Pollution and offering its assistance and cooperation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the development of a suitable program. The importance of doing something about air pollution in this country increases every day and it is hoped that recognition of that importance will be extended at the earliest possible time.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the contamination of our Nation's community air supplies have become an important national problem; and

Whereas many public and private groups and associations are conducting activities directed toward the solution of this problem; and

Whereas a better common understanding of the goals, requirements, and problems of these many groups and communities would facilitate a more rapid solution to the basic problem; and

Whereas the Air Pollution Control Association has long supported all constructive efforts to further understanding of the causes and dimensions of the air pollution problem, and to provide an effective ex-

change of views and opinions relevant to its solution; and

Whereas these purposes were served in an outstanding fashion by the 1958 National Conference on Air Pollution, convened by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved

1. That the Air Pollution Control Association does hereby urge the President of the United States, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the U.S. Surgeon General to convene another National Conference on Air Pollution during the year 1961 or 1962.

2. That the Air Pollution Control Association extend its cooperation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the development of a suitable program.

History of Vending in the United States— 75th Anniversary of the Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "A Concise History of Vending in the United States," written by G. R. Schreiber, editor of *Vend*, the magazine of the vending industry.

This concise history of vending by Mr. Schreiber is really a great tribute to the enormous growth of the industry during its 75 years of existence as an organized industry in the United States. This is the 75th anniversary of the vending industry in this country and all signs indicate that the industry, while big and lusty and growing, merely is on the threshold of its greatest growth.

It seems hard to believe that vending, which represented only a small total business only a few decades ago, today enjoys a business running into several billion dollars, gross, each year. As noted, all signs indicate that it is merely on the threshold of enormous and unparalleled growth and service.

I believe that *Vend* magazine, and its alert editor and publisher, G. R. Schreiber, perform a real service to the industry and to the Nation by distributing such authoritative information about the industry as is embodied in this material.

The material is as follows:

A CONCISE HISTORY OF VENDING IN THE UNITED STATES

(By G. R. Schreiber)

Part and parcel of the 20th century revolution in retailing is the vending machine—the silent salesman with built-in cash register which annually moves billions of dollars of goods and services to consumers in the United States and around the world.

The practical impact of the vending machine on our economy was not generally recognized prior to the middle and late 1940's. But the idea of selling things from machines is nearly as old as recorded history, and the beginning of the modern vending industry came in the last half of the 19th century.

In 215 B.C., the mathematician Hero produced a book entitled "Pneumatika," in

which he described many of his own inventions and the inventions of his teacher, Tesibius. Pupil and teacher lived and worked in Alexandria during the golden age of Greece.

Hero's original manuscript is lost, but it was copied and in 1587 the copy was translated into Italian with illustrations. In "Pneumatika," Hero described and illustrated a coin-actuated device to be used for vending sacrificial water in Egyptian temples. The device was completely automatic and was set in operation by the insertion of "a coin of five drachmas," equivalent in modern money to approximately 75 cents. Whether the holy water vending machine was the invention of Hero or Tesibius cannot be determined from the manuscript. Nor is there any evidence that the device was widely used.

From the time Hero wrote his book until its translation into Italian, nothing is known to indicate that other inventors tinkered with selling machines. It could be that the translation of Hero's "Pneumatika" revived interest in the idea of vending since snuff and tobacco boxes, activated by the insertion of coins, appeared in English taverns and inns during 1615. Actually, the 17th century tobacco and snuff venders were less sophisticated than Hero's invention and left considerably more to the honesty of the customer.

These tobacco and snuff venders, made of polished brass, operated on the old English half pence, a coin somewhat larger than a quarter but smaller than a half dollar. When the coin was inserted in the top of the device, it flipped a trigger which caused the lid covering one half of the top to fly open. The customer could then reach in to retrieve a pinch of snuff or to fill the bowl of his pipe. After each purchase the innkeeper or barmaid pushed the lid shut and moved the vender on to the next customer. The device was small (9½ inches long, 4½ inches wide and 4 inches deep), had a handle for carrying, and held approximately a pound of tobacco.

A number of these early vending machines were brought to the Colonies, and a few survive in museums and as the property of private collectors.

The first attempt to vend a product other than snuff or tobacco also came in England, at the beginning of the 19th century—a 100-year period which would see inventors and promoters produce or promise an astounding variety of automatic selling devices.

In 1822, an English freethinker and bookseller named Richard Carlile constructed a vending machine he hoped would baffle the police and censors. This was at the time when a courageous handful of booksellers and publishers were struggling to establish freedom for the English press. Carlile and some of his employees had been jailed for selling works such as Thomas Paine's "The Age of Reason." To prevent such arrests, Carlile conceived the idea of selling books by machine so that the seller could not then be legally identified.

The Republican, a newspaper published by Carlile, described the device to prospective clients:

"Perhaps it will amuse you to be informed that in the new Temple of Reason my publications are sold by clockwork. In the shop is the dial on which is written every publication for sale. The purchaser enters and turns the hand of the dial to the publication he wants, when, on depositing his money, the publication drops down before him."

Unfortunately, the courts held Carlile responsible nevertheless and convicted one of his employees of selling blasphemous literature through the device. Whether the device was truly automatic cannot be established today, but it was clearly an application of the vending principle.

Thirty-five years later, in 1857, one Simeon Denham was issued a British patent for a vending machine. This appears to be the first automatic selling device covered by patent law. The Denham machine was a postage stamp vender which fed a single stamp out upon the insertion of a penny. It was a crude device and did not get beyond the idea stage until some 30 years later when inventors began an all-out assault on the problem of selling stamps automatically.

In England, the Scandinavian nations, France, and Germany, inventors intrigued with the vending principle built or designed numerous models of coin-operated weighing scales, tobacco, gum, and candy machines. As long ago as 1867, the German inventor-engineer Carl Ade built models of machines to sell handkerchiefs, cigarettes, and confections. Many of the inventors took the precaution of patenting their devices throughout the world—in India, Luxembourg, Spain, New South Wales, Tasmania, Cape of Good Hope, South Australia, Canada, New Zealand.

The first U.S. patent issued for a vending machine went in 1884 to W. H. Fruen for an "automatic drawing device." Fruen's patent (No. 309,219) bears a close resemblance to Hero's holy water dispenser, but the machine was never produced in quantity.

One year later, in 1885, a group of New York promoters introduced the penny weighing scale to the United States. Imported from Germany, the scale was a massive machine weighing some 600 pounds. The workings were enclosed in a mahogany cabinet which was liberally decorated with intricate carvings.

In 1886, a group of patents, some for original machines and some improved models of earlier inventions, were applied for at the U.S. Patent Office. The inventors—Percival Everitt, Chas. H. Russell, Frederick C. Lynde—were Englishmen.

Everitt had patented his invention in 1885 in England and had been granted patents around the world. Some indication of the trials and tribulations of the early vending machine designer (and, for that matter, of their successors in the years to come) is contained in Percival Everitt's patent application.

Everitt observed that his patent (No. 374,297) was an invention improving an earlier patent dated July 23, 1885. "It has been found in practice," Everitt's application said, "that although the apparatus is misused articles such as paper, orangepeel, and other rubbish have been maliciously placed in the slit provided for the admission of the coin, and that in consequence the channel provided for the passage of the coins from the slit became blocked."

Thus it was that early in the development of the vending machine the American public came to regard the silent salesman as fair game—to "beat" the machine or, failing that, to stuff an orangepeel down its innards to put it out of commission. Reckoning with this perversity is still a mighty challenge for designers and engineers.

Some indication of the early progress automatic vending made abroad, and was to make in the United States, can be gathered from the fact that on November 25, 1887, the Sweetmeat Automatic Delivery Co., Ltd., was registered in England—the first company organized to install and maintain automatic vending machines as its principal business.

The real beginnings of practical vending in the United States came in 1888 when Thomas Adams, founder of the Adams Gum Co., subsequently the American Chicle Co., had machines designed to sell his Tutti-Frutti gum on New York City's elevated platforms. From the outset, Adams' gum machines could be counted successful and, from that day to this, the vending machine has been a considerable factor in the marketing plans of American chewing gum manufacturers.

Just what prompted Adams to turn to vending, and to make his first installations on the El platforms, is a matter of conjecture. But the same thought struck other pioneers in other parts of the world. In 1889, for example, commercial vending was introduced in France to raise money for philanthropy. The Society of the Stores for the Blind, a charitable organization, installed 10-centime chocolate and bon-bon machines in the railroad stations along the Paris-Marseilles line and their success led to the rise of French vending industry.

The last decade of the 19th century witnessed a rash of new vending machine inventions, the formation of dozens of early vending companies (some, like the Watling Manufacturing Co., Chicago, still survive), and the development caught the fancy of the American press.

In its June 28, 1890, edition, *Scientific American* took note of the invention in England of an automatic picture-taking machine. "It is proposed," the magazine told its readers, "to erect automatic photographing machines, corresponding in a general way to the other machines of this class for weighing, selling candy, etc., with which the public is now familiar."

In Paris that same year, the city government adopted a law which forbade the drivers of horse-drawn cabs from using charcoal burners to keep their passengers' feet warm. As a substitute for the burners, a number of hot water vending machines were set up in street-corner kiosks. The machines delivered 9 quarts of boiling hot water when the proper coin was inserted and hackdrivers used cans of hot water as a substitute for their charcoal burners. The machines likewise served as a source of supply for some of the city's poor who had no other source of hot water in their homes.

Putting a voice in the silent salesman was tried for the first time in New York in 1890. This, as we shall see, was an idea which keeps recurring in the development and expansion of the vending principal. The first talking vending machine was a penny scale which incorporated a crude phonograph. When a patron inserted a coin, and while he read his weight on the dial, the phonograph played a brief passage from some well-known opera or popular tune. It developed, however, that the public wanted accurate weight rather than entertainment and the talking scale faded from the scene.

France seems to have taken to vending with great gusto once the bonbon and chocolate machines began popping up in numbers. Naturally enough, the French quickly conceived the idea of extending the vending principle to the nation's most famous product. A report in *Scientific American* for December 26, 1891, describes in considerable detail the rise of the "automatic fountain" in Paris and other French cities.

"In the automatic distributors of which we speak," *Scientific American's* reporter wrote, "It suffices to put a coin, say a 5-cent piece, in a slot, when a tube placed beneath the money box allows a small glass of malaga, a large glass of beer, etc., to flow. The apparatus operates with perfect regularity, and the quantity of liquid is always accurately measured, its volume varying with its nature. There are distributors of this kind that serve hot liquids (such as coffee) or iced ones. A series of different types is at present installed at the Exposition of Labor at the Palace of Industry. Our Parisian readers will there be able to observe the regularity with which these automatic apparatus operate. Several bars provided with them are installed in different parts of Paris."

An illustration accompanying the text showed a bar in Montmartre with dozens of barrel-shaped automatic "distributors." So

far as is known, this was the first time numbers of vending machines were arranged in a bank or battery, a practice continued off and on until the great depression and revived during the 1950's in the United States.

Scientific American viewed the development of automatic vending with good favor. The publication told its readers that vending machines were a boon to both the consumer and the producer.

"To the consumer, the automatic distributor offers the advantage of immediately delivering for a moderate sum, and without any loss of time, an accurately measured quantity of a hot or cold beverage furnished directly by the producer. The latter, selling his merchandise directly, can deliver it at a very low but remunerative price, and, through the aid of the apparatus with placards, circulars, etc., put at the consumer's disposal, can obtain the best of advertisements."

These arguments on behalf of the vending machine are still used, and still convincing. *Scientific American's* reporter did indicate, however, that these machines were not without their detractors as witness the following:

"In fact, these automatic distributors of liquids already have, for natural enemies, all the manufacturers whose indifferent or unwholesome products cannot undergo the decisive test of previous testing.

"We cannot dwell," the periodical continued, "upon the numerous applications to which the automatic distributors of liquids may be put outside of the simple establishments of consumption. In railway stations, public gardens, etc., it will be possible to utilize these apparatus, either with the charitable object in view of furnishing the poor with wholesome and strengthening beverages (such as milk, bouillon, etc.) at a low price, or with the simple motive of making a new product known and appreciated."

In the United States, meantime, the postage stamp vending machine was coming into its own. Early attempts had been made by Automatic Machine Co., Chicago, and Postage Stamp Service Machine Co., New York, to launch operations of stamp venders. But the first successful large scale operation of stamp venders were undertaken in 1891 by the Automatic Machine Company of Buffalo, N.Y. The Buffalo company used a penny stamp vender invented by William Dutton, and the machine was hailed in the newspapers of the day as an "honest slot machine" because it sold a penny stamp for a penny.

In 1892, John Williams, of Manchester, England, invented and patented a ticket vending machine. Once a coin was inserted, a bell rang and a ticket was automatically issued. A register on the device indicated how many tickets had been dispensed.

James Angell Hardman, Editor and Publisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, last week one of the leading editors and publishers of smaller daily newspapers in the United States died, bringing to an end a life of true public service. Not only did James A. Hardman publish the North Adams Transcript, but he was a

civic leader in all of the northern Berkshires of Massachusetts.

During his 81 years he labored for the Red Cross, struggled to explain and promote liberty loan war bonds during World War I, and was instrumental in the perennial success of the North Adams Community Chest. James Hardman used commonsense to determine when his newspaper should speak out for public causes to benefit the entire community. His accurate judgment earned him the respect and love of all who knew him.

Almost alone Mr. Hardman rescued the North Adams State Teachers College from economic obliteration and put it back on its current stable basis. The force for civic betterment that a daily newspaper can become is well exemplified by the modern hospital that stands in North Adams today. The fundraising campaign of the Transcript was a major factor in the building of that hospital, and the Transcript's publisher was one of its trustees. James Hardman was long a director of the chamber of commerce, one of the first members of the Rotary Club, the only honorary life director of the North Adams National Bank, and a pioneer in the communications media of radio.

But what did his fellow newspapermen think of him? The honor and respect of those in his own profession has evidenced itself in life as well as death. I include below the memorials of two of his nearest neighbors, the Transcript-Telegram of Holyoke and Berkshire Eagle of Pittsfield.

[From the Holyoke (Mass.) Transcript-Telegram, Sept. 16, 1961]

SO FAR AND NO FARTHER

The death of James Angell Hardman, editor-publisher of the North Adams Transcript for half a century, just about closes out a chapter in western Massachusetts newspaper life. When he came out of Williams College to join forces with his father in the management of the fine North Adams paper, established in 1843, he found himself moving into a notable circle of newspaper men holding top positions in the newspaper field in three of the four western counties. Those men were his own father, Kelton B. Miller, of the Berkshire Eagle in Pittsfield, Solomon P. Griffin of the Springfield Republican, Henry S. Gere of the Hampshire Gazette and William G. Dwight of the Holyoke Transcript. They had established a school of newspaper thought and management despite the fact that all were individualists to the core.

Their lines of thought merged into a common highway much of the time. Mr. Griffin still clung to the lares and penates of the House of Bowles and rated the whole wide world as his realm for report and suggestion. But on more than one occasion he would suggest that it was not for him to advise how things be run in Boston, Washington or London until, and unless, something was done to better conditions in Springfield, Mass.

As for the others, their home communities were both their primary and secondary interests. What was good for the community was good for the newspaper in the long run and they had inherited from their ancestral lines the ability to take the long look ahead.

By the time Jim Hardman had been elevated to full control of the North Adams Transcript that famous quartet was moving off into the shadows but their teachings still had force to guide their successors, even to the second and third generation. The belief

that there is a permanent place in the American picture for smaller newspapers to provide something that larger newspapers cannot possibly provide, and that their special mission is to put their shoulders to the wheel of progress, at the same time holding to the established truths in human experience, is the source of their general success.

Personally Jim Hardman was of the type to which the word "lovable" can be safely attached. But with that form of love went a deep and abiding respect for built-in something that he had which said "so far and no farther" to anything that he did not believe was the better way for his community and his newspaper code.

[From the Berkshire (Mass.) Eagle, Sept. 14, 1961]

JAMES A. HARDMAN, RESPECTED EDITOR

North Adams has lost one of its first citizens in the death at 81 of James Angell Hardman, but it has received from him a rich heritage. The North Adams Transcript, which he served as editor and publisher for so many years, is a responsible and highly respected institution largely because it reflects the qualities with which his leadership imbued it.

That Mr. Hardman was the key factor in the Transcript's emergence as a first-rate small newspaper is a matter of record. At the time he left Williams College to join the family business in 1901 the Transcript was a venerable but struggling enterprise engaged in an uphill fight against strong local competition. Under his direction it grew in both prosperity and prestige, becoming in 1924 the only surviving daily in northern Berkshire.

But Mr. Hardman was much more than a good businessman. Because he believed strongly in the basic principles of enlightened journalism, he was able to make the Transcript into an effective voice that was listened to and respected. Quiet and unassuming as a person, he was not given to table pounding and shrill crusading as an editor. But his firmness in espousing what he felt was good for North Adams and good for the Berkshire was unshakable, even when the cause was not always popular.

To most of the employees at the Transcript, Mr. Hardman was known as "the skipper"—a nickname reflecting the warm respect in which he was held by those most closely associated with him. A newspaperman first and last, he was deeply rooted in a community which he served with understanding and affection. The affection was mutual.

Those Glen Canyon Transmission Lines— Some Facts and Figures on a Bitter Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, recently the House of Representatives voted to appropriate sufficient funds to commence construction of the backbone power transmission lines of the upper Colorado River storage project, by the Bureau of Reclamation. My distinguished colleague from Arizona [Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL] prepared for distribution a statement discussing the above matter. I feel it in the general public

interest that his statement be made available to all those interested in this issue. For that reason I now insert his statement in the RECORD:

THOSE GLEN CANYON TRANSMISSION LINES— SOME FACTS AND FIGURES ON A BITTER DISPUTE

(A special report by Representative MORRIS K. UDALL)

Since I came to Congress in May, my office has been flooded with more mail on one single issue than the combined total dealing with Castro, Berlin, Aid to Education, and foreign aid. Many writers, it soon became apparent, did not have complete or adequate information about the issues or facts involved in this dispute. The matter has now been resolved by the House of Representatives, and it occurs to me that many Arizonians might want a background paper on the facts and issues as they appeared to me. I earnestly hope that those who have criticized my stand will be willing to take a look at the other side of the story—for it has received little attention in the Arizona press.

It is always sad to see a falling out among reputable and important Arizona industrial groups. In these past months we have witnessed a fierce struggle which has divided two important segments of the Arizona electrical industry. For many years Arizona Public Service Co. (APSCO) and such public or consumer-owned utilities as city of Mesa, Salt River Valley Water Users Association, the electrical districts, REA co-ops, etc., have worked harmoniously solving the electrical needs of a growing State. Since early 1961, however, APSCO has been locked in deadly combat with the other groups. Charges and countercharges have filled the air.

The largest part of my mail has directly resulted from a very large, expensive (and most effective) public relations effort by APSCO, working in close cooperation with the Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette. Speakers for APSCO have fanned out from its headquarters into every county courthouse and to hundreds of service clubs and civic groups.

Let me hasten to add that I bear APSCO no ill will. It has every right to present its case to the public in any legitimate fashion. As far as I know, its extensive lobbying and public relations programs have been conducted with propriety and are above reproach. Its representatives have treated me with courtesy and friendliness, and I have carefully listened to their arguments. No threats, reprisals, or pressure tactics have been directed against me.

On the other hand there is a strong case to be made for construction of the lines by the Bureau of Reclamation as I shall outline below. The many Arizonians who favor this approach have not been as well organized or financed as APSCO, and they have had meager newspaper support. For these reasons their contentions have not been widely heard or understood.

BACKGROUND OF THE CONTROVERSY

The most important single factor in the growth and economic success of Arizona and the West has been the Federal reclamation program which Theodore Roosevelt began in 1902 with the authorization of the Salt River Valley project—a model multipurpose reclamation job. This was followed by Hoover, Davis, Parker and other dams.

These projects—and future ones like Central Arizona, Buttes Dam, Charleston Dam—may be the key to our future. All of them have been attacked by their opponents as unsound waste of tax dollars; yet every project has been so designed and planned that it would be completely self-liquidating over the life of the project.

The latest chapter in reclamation was written in 1956 when Congress authorized the Colorado River storage project. This project calls for construction of four large dams:

1. Glen Canyon, Page, Ariz.
2. Flaming Gorge, on Green River in north-eastern Utah.
3. Curecanti, on Gunnison River in western Colorado.
4. Navajo, on San Juan River in northwestern New Mexico.

In addition the 1956 law authorized more than 35 participating irrigation projects. These will eventually be constructed in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The plan Congress approved provides a financing system which will return to the taxpayers—over an 86-year period—the full cost of these dams and participating projects. While the project is designed principally to promote irrigation and water control, it has important recreation and other byproducts. But electricity is the key, for most of the revenue to "pay out" the cost must come from sale of the electric energy produced by the dams. The Federal Government will own and operate the dams and generators, and will sell the energy to (a) publically owned and consumer-owned utilities, and (b) to private utilities. The public and consumer-owned groups are designated by law as "preference customers," meaning that they have first right to buy available power. Any power not claimed by the preference groups is sold to private utilities. This is the identical arrangement under which the Bureau of Reclamation sells energy from Hoover, Davis and Parker Dams to APSCO, Tucson Gas Electric Co. and to various preference customers. The Bureau has never delivered power to homes or businesses. It sells only to utility companies.

The preference customers in Arizona include cities like Mesa, Safford, and Thatcher which own their own electric system; irrigation districts like Roosevelt Water conservation District in Maricopa County; REA co-ops like Trico, Sulphur Springs Valley, Graham County, Mohave, and Navopache; and electric districts such as the four which serve the farmers of Pinal County.

The 1956 act directed the Bureau of Reclamation to build the dams (as it is now doing at Glen Canyon), install the necessary generators (now on order) and "construct, operate, and maintain . . . powerplants, transmission facilities and appurtenant works." In addition, section 7 of the act provided that "the hydroelectric powerplants and transmission lines authorized by the act to be constructed, operated, and maintained by the Secretary shall be operated in conjunction with other Federal powerplants, present and potential, so as to produce the greatest practicable amount of power and energy that can be sold at firm power and energy rates."

The 1956 Arizona delegation to Congress (Hayden, Goldwater, Rhodes, and Udall) unanimously supported the bill. APSCO and other utilities favored and urged the project.

When Glen Canyon Dam was begun Interior Secretary Seaton undertook to plan and design a "backbone" transmission network which would (a) interconnect the new dams, as well as the one in Green Mountain, Colo.; and (b) move the power to population centers in Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming where it could be sold.

In 1959 and 1960 five large private utilities (Arizona Public Service Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Co., of Colorado, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Utah Power & Light Co.) in these five States undertook a campaign to persuade Secretary Seaton that he should build some of the Federal lines contemplated, but not all of them. They offered to build certain lines—including two from Glen Canyon to the dis-

tribution point at Pinnacle Peak north of Phoenix. They offered to make wheeling agreements under which they would transmit the Government's power over private utilities' lines for a fee or wheeling charge.

Secretary Seaton studied the offer, sought private consultant's advice, and, just before leaving office, rejected the offer. Seaton contended that acceptance would result in (a) higher power costs, and (b) would fail to produce the revenue necessary for the whole project to pay out, and build the participating irrigation projects.

In early 1961 the new Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, was urged by the utility companies to review this decision. After a careful review and another opinion from private consultants, he confirmed Seaton's findings and decision.

BATTLE MOVES TO CONGRESS

The power companies then carried their fight to the Congress. The 1961 public works appropriation bill contained an item of some \$5 million for first-phase construction of the Federal "backbone" lines. The utilities asked the Congress to delete this item. This would have left the Bureau of Reclamation without funds to build the Federal system, forcing it to negotiate wheeling agreements with the five private utilities.

The House Appropriations Committee in early September 1961, after full consideration and lengthy hearings, defeated 27 to 17 an amendment to remove this item from the appropriation. When the bill came to the House floor on September 12, Representative JENSEN, of Iowa, offered an amendment to delete the \$5 million item. After a thorough debate the House voted 134 to 114 in Committee of the Whole to retain it. After passage of the bill, Representative JENSEN moved to recommit the entire public works appropriation bill to the committee with instructions to delete the money for these lines. This motion was defeated 224 to 182. I voted with the majority.

The APSCO proposal had been fully debated in the House. The utilities had had their "day in court" and had been defeated. I felt with many other Congressmen that the motion to recommit would only reopen a controversial matter which had been settled, would probably throw the entire matter into the 1962 session—thus delaying and threatening the timing of this gigantic project—and would imperil about \$3.6 billion of other important public works projects, financed by the bill.

Among the projects which would have been delayed were the Camelsback Reservoir near Safford, \$800,000; planning for the Tucson diversion channel, \$149,000; Colorado levee system near Yuma, \$1,590,000; Gila project in Yuma Irrigation District, \$800,000; and Glen Canyon Dam construction, \$19,895,000.

THE NUB OF THE DISPUTE

In the framework of this background let me now try to summarize the basic problem as I approached it:

1. At the outset I recognized that the Colorado River storage project (CRSP) is an irrigation and reclamation project. Electricity is secondary, important only as the source of revenue to build the reclamation works.

2. If (and this is the big argument) APSCO and its partners could build the particular lines and wheel power for the Government without endangering payout of the dams and irrigation works, I would favor giving them the job.

3. On the other hand, if handing these profitable lines to APSCO and its associates would drain the project basin fund of revenue to pay out and develop water projects as intended in the act, the Bureau should build the lines.

Since May I have spent hundreds of hours reading the contentions of the two factions.

I have attended more than 10 briefing sessions sponsored by one side or the other. Dozens of Arizonians have come to my office to present their views, and hundreds more have written. These expressions have been considered. I listened to every word of the House debate.

Both sides have impressive figures. Both can't be right. Someone is wrong:

(a) APSCO presented beautifully documented brochures and charts which analyzed its proposed construction of lines and wheeling charges. Its figures, if correct, proved that the wheeling arrangement would not result in increased power rates for the preference customers, and would permit the Bureau of Reclamation to pay out on schedule.

(b) The Bureau of Reclamation and the public and consumer-owned utilities present beautifully documented brochures and charts which analyzed the results under Federal construction as against the wheeling arrangement. These figures, if correct, prove that the APSCO proposal would result in either higher power rates for consumers, or deficient pay out funds, or both.

The House Appropriations Committee, after extensive hearings found the Bureau figures more persuasive. The committee's decision was supported by the House of Representatives. This seemed the safe course to a substantial majority of my colleagues from other States. If APSCO's proposal had been accepted—and if its figures turned out to be wrong—irreparable damage would have been done to a billion-dollar project. Reclamation—never a popular subject with eastern congressmen—would have been discredited. Substantial appropriations would be required to bail out an unsound project. Future projects for Arizona and other western States would have been imperiled.

On the other hand, everyone has agreed that payout would be guaranteed under the Federal system. We have a large enough Federal deficit without gambling on the return of this \$1 billion investment.

PARTICULAR ARGUMENTS DISCUSSED

In the balance of this memorandum I will briefly discuss under 15 headings some of the major arguments dividing the disputing forces, and some of the important conclusions which I have reached.

1. APSCO's proposal would discriminate in favor of Maricopa County

In making my decision on this issue I have sought a solution which would distribute impartially within Arizona the benefits of this important project. In my judgment, the APSCO proposal would have given one large private utility in the Phoenix area distinct advantages over other utilities in other parts of the State. These advantages would have included the privilege of integrating Government power into the APSCO system and borrowing it in times of greatest need. This could result in reducing APSCO's construction costs for generation facilities—all to the advantage of APSCO stockholders and its electric customers. Southern Arizona and the Second Congressional District should not suffer at the expense of Phoenix. The Arizona Power Authority, as our State's independent broker in delivering Colorado River power, has made a proud record working in cooperation with both private and public power interests. If the Glen Canyon energy were controlled not by the Arizona Power Authority but by APSCO, the result, in my judgment, would have been a tremendous disadvantage to the electric consumers in Pima, Cochise, Santa Cruz, and Pinal Counties who now receive through the APA a proportionate share of the Hoover-Parker-Davis energy. I was most anxious that my congressional district not be discriminated against in the distribution of this power or the benefits and I became convinced that APSCO's proposal might well have this result.

2. Construction of the Federal "backbone" transmission system is the traditional, accepted pattern of reclamation projects

Historically, the Bureau of Reclamation has always constructed its own transmission lines connecting large dams in an area with each other and with the population centers where the power is delivered. The Government has never gone into the business of selling power to consumers. It has never constructed steamplants but develops power from water sources only. It builds only the backbone or skeleton transmission systems. The flesh and muscle lines are filled in by private and public utility companies. This pattern has been followed with power generated at Parker, Hoover, Davis, and other dams in our area. This Bureau of Reclamation power has been sold to APSCO, Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power Co., and other Arizona utilities. The lines from the dams to population centers were designed and built by the Bureau of Reclamation, but the United States is repaid in full with interest from power revenues over a period of years.

3. APSCO proposal would not save taxpayers money

It has been broadly claimed that APSCO, by building the lines, would save U.S. taxpayers some \$175 million. This is true only from a short-range standpoint. The money to build the Colorado River storage project dams and lines will be fully repaid with interest to the taxpayers in the same fashion as other reclamation projects. In addition, these projects will generate new business and new wealth which will create, as the Salt River project created, large new tax sources. More importantly, however, we should note this: the utilities do not offer to build the lines and transfer the electricity free of charge for the Federal Government. They are asking the Government to pay them every year for the life of the project a wheeling charge. The House Appropriations Committee staff estimates that the Federal Government would pay APSCO and its partners over the life of the project \$575 million in wheeling charges. These moneys would have to be appropriated every year and paid by the taxpayers to these utilities. Thus the U.S. taxpayer ends up with a drawer full of rent receipts rather than a revenue-producing asset owned by the Government. True the U.S. taxpayers might make an immediate saving of \$175 million by letting APSCO and the other companies build the lines, but will pay the private utilities \$575 million for wheeling services. This does not seem like any bargain for taxpayers, and explains why the private utilities can speak so generously about the taxes they will pay.

4. The APSCO proposal would give it control of a \$1 billion taxpayer investment

The taxpayers of the United States will have an investment of \$1 billion in the dams and works making up the Colorado River storage project. APSCO and its partners proposed to spend about \$100 million building the key transmission lines. Yet these lines would effectively control the whole system. The unfairness of this argument was noted in a recent Herblock cartoon in the Washington Post where the private utilities were shown telling the U.S. taxpayer "We generously let you pay for the cow—all we ask is that you let us take the cream."

5. APSCO would have the Government build isolated unprofitable transmission lines

One single important fact has been almost entirely overlooked in all of the controversy. APSCO and its partners have never said to the Government, "Let us build all of the lines you will need for this system." On the contrary, they have always urged that Uncle Sam must and should build many of the transmission lines required to properly interconnect the system. Many of these lines are under construction now. APSCO

asks to build only the profitable key lines which are vital to control of the whole system. For example, APSCO still urges Congress to appropriate taxpayers' money to build a line from Glen Canyon to Four Corners. This line runs across the most desolate parts of Arizona, where electrical consumers are as scarce as parking meters. On the other hand, APSCO demanded the right to build the Glen Canyon-Phoenix line because it is the single most profitable part in the system. If it is right for APSCO to build one line, it ought to be willing to build the other.

6. APSCO's proposal would endanger participating projects

As noted above, the Colorado River storage project was primarily intended and designed to finance reclamation and irrigation works in the Upper Colorado Basin States. The officials of these States strongly objected to the APSCO proposal on the grounds that their participating projects could not be financed. It was estimated in the House debate that the basin fund which pays for the participating projects would be \$273 million short if the wheeling arrangements were to be made. The Water Conservation Board of the State of Colorado (the official agency of that State in matters pertaining to reclamation development) made an intensive study and took a strong stand for Bureau of Reclamation construction of the lines. Gov. Steve McNichols, of Colorado, urged Governor Fannin and every member of Arizona's delegation to oppose the APSCO proposal. Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, of the House Interior Committee, a man with more knowledge of reclamation than any other Member of the House, said in the course of the House debate that he had been confused by the conflicting claims and had undertaken to obtain the advice of an independent engineering consultant:

"On the basis of his study, the dollar amounts which would be received as net revenues in the basic fund and available for development of participating projects . . . would be about \$117 million more under an all-Federal system than under the private utilities proposal, and the financial advantage of the all-Federal system after the year 2049 would be about \$4.8 million per year. Again I point out that this is based upon using the utilities' figures. The Bureau's study comparing the utilities' proposal with the so-called modified system, shows a difference in favor of an all-Federal system of \$275 million over the same period."

7. APSCO proposal might result in higher power rates for thousands of Arizona city consumers, farmers, and REA users

One of the major difficulties I had in making a decision was the completely contradictory claims made by the two sides. APSCO strongly claimed that its wheeling proposal would not result in higher rates for customers of the municipally owned systems, of Salt River project, of the REA co-ops, and of the electrical districts. On the other hand the organized consumer groups directly affected expressed deep concern over this prospect and had figures tending to support their views. I have had hundreds of letters from consumers in Mesa, in Pinal County, and elsewhere expressing these fears. For example, Paul Pearce, mayor of Eloy, said in a telegram: "As a farmer in Eloy area firmly believe Federal construction of Glen Canyon Dam transmission system is only method to retain present cheap power rates for irrigation pumping. Suggest and urge your leadership in coming days."

8. This is not a private enterprise versus socialism issue

APSCO and the other private utilities have raised the cry, "Let free enterprise do the job," and all of us can support this slogan as a general proposition. However, this is an emotional argument which bears little weight because APSCO is not engaged in free

enterprise as we ordinarily understand it. It is a regulated monopoly with no competitors, with a guaranteed rate of return to its stockholders. Its investments are subsidized in part by quick tax writeoffs. APSCO and its partners did not ask to build the dams; indeed they urged the United States to build them in order to promote the economy of these Western States. They did not cry "socialism" or "Government handout" when the Government built Glen Canyon Dam, nor when it undertook to purchase and install the huge generators there. Socialism became the issue only when the Government undertook to build all of the transmission lines needed to sell the electricity to pay for the dams. The Colorado River storage project is a related, interconnected series of dams, generators, lines, and irrigation works. It seems hardly logical to split off one small, profitable part of an integrated whole and give it to a regulated monopoly in the name of free enterprise.

9. Bureau of Reclamation has an excellent record. It does not seek to dominate private enterprise

We hear many criticisms of our Federal Government and of "bureaucrats," yet Arizonans have nearly always placed the Bureau of Reclamation above criticism. It has an international reputation for building such dams as Hoover, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, et cetera, and its hard-working personnel have constructed more dams and transmission lines than any organization in the world. Interior Secretary Fred Seaton and President Eisenhower thoroughly considered the arguments of APSCO and rejected their proposal. Certainly Mr. Seaton, a prominent Republican Nebraska businessman, has a belief in free enterprise and an opposition to socialism which are beyond question. His decision was made on a nonpartisan basis and it was reaffirmed when the present Democratic administration and the present Interior Secretary reached the same conclusions.

10. The Federal "backbone" system is no threat to APSCO and the private utilities

APSCO and its partners have made extreme charges in the heat of battle, going so far as to contend that the Bureau of Reclamation is trying to dominate the electrical industry throughout the United States. I would fight such an effort if it were ever made, but the argument ignores the facts: when all the dams in the Colorado River storage project are fully operating, they will generate about 1 million kilowatts. APSCO in a booklet filed with my office estimates that the five private utilities involved in this controversy will generate and sell in 1980 a total power load of 20 million kilowatts, or about 20 times the capacity of these dams. I cannot understand how anyone can seriously claim that the power production of these dams could be any threat to private enterprise. The tail will not wag the dog. In the United States more than 80 percent of all electrical customers are served by private power, and this is as it should be. The Bureau of Reclamation now has harmonious interconnection arrangements with APSCO in other Arizona areas. Even under the all-Federal system, there will be particular phases where wheeling arrangements will be made with private utilities in the Upper Colorado Basin.

11. What about the \$750,000 in taxes APSCO would pay Arizona?

APSCO has aroused many leaders in northern Arizona by holding out the bait of an estimated \$750,000 in taxes which it claims it would pay if it constructed the proposed lines. The estimate is highly exaggerated, according to independent sources, and is nothing more than a guess. Even Representative RHODES, who has supported the position of the private utilities in this controversy, could not accept APSCO's claim that it will pay \$750,000 in taxes to Arizona.

He placed the figure, in a report to his constituents, at "somewhere between \$350,000 and \$450,000 annually." In any event, this money was not offered as a charitable contribution from the generosity of APSCO. This tax money would have come from utility charges paid by consumers located principally in Phoenix and southern Arizona. These proposed lines would not have been located in Maricopa, Pima, or any of the large population centers. For the most part, they would have traversed remote, mountainous areas where there are no cities, or crowded school districts with high tax rates, mostly on Federal lands. Taking average taxes for the Phoenix area and applying them to improvements in remote areas is absurd.

Furthermore, APSCO is already building two new generating plants at Four Corners and Joseph City, and is already underway with definite plans for a large transmission line from Four Corners to Phoenix. These lines will pay taxes, even though they don't carry Federal power.

12. The House vote was decisive and bipartisan

The decision by the House of Representatives against the APSCO proposal was decisive and bipartisan. Five States were directly concerned: Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. These States have 11 Congressmen. Ten of the eleven voted for the Federal transmission system: Republicans HARRISON, of Wyoming, CHENOWETH and DOMINICK, of Colorado, and Democrats ASPINALL and ROGERS, of Colorado, MORRIS and MONTOYA, of New Mexico, KING and PETERSON, of Utah, and UDALL, of Arizona. It is probable that Colorado Basin Senators will vote likewise with the exceptions of Senator GOLDWATER and Senator BENNETT, Republicans of Arizona and Utah.

In the House these Republicans, in addition to those named above, voted to reject the APSCO plan: ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; CORBETT, of Pennsylvania; CUNNINGHAM, MARTIN, and WEAVER, of Nebraska; ELLSWORTH, McVEY, and SHRIVER, of Kansas; HORAN, MAY, and TOLLEFSON, of Washington; MERROW, of New Hampshire; MOSHER, of Ohio; O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; REECE, of Tennessee; REIFEL, of South Dakota; STAFFORD, of Vermont.

13. Many prominent, intelligent Arizonans oppose APSCO plan

From some of the newspaper publicity, one might conclude that APSCO's proposal was opposed only by a few bureaucrats and misguided liberals. This is not the case.

My office has received hundreds of communications from prominent, intelligent and sincere business, farm, and civic leaders who favor Bureau of Reclamation construction.

Here is a sample of their comments and a cross section of the prominent leaders who support the Bureau of Reclamation position:

Mayor E. J. Brown, Mesa, commenting on appropriation committee action including funds for the Federal grid: "We are sure that the committee has made the move after full consideration of all the factors involved. We commend the committeemen for their action."

William T. Elliott, chairman, Electrical District No. 4, Pinal County: "The directors of Electrical District No. 4 individually and collectively urge your support for Federal construction. We believe this is the only salvation for our members."

Dewey Farr, Navopache Electric Co-Operative, Inc., Lakeside: "Relative to the transmission lines connecting the various Bureau hydroelectric generating plans, I think that those already constructed should remain the property of the Federal Government and that the Federal Government should continue to construct those facilities, for the purpose of transmitting power from generating plants to the points of distribution."

Paul H. Jones, prominent insurance executive, Tucson: "I believe that it would be a mistake to reverse the thinking of the current and past administrations by turning this over to the private power companies. I am a great believer in private enterprise, but I question the advisability of using large amounts of Government funds to build a project and then turn it over to private industry, particularly one who has not always worked completely in the public interest."

Among others who have written to support the Bureau plan are Mayor Don Hummel of Tucson; Mayor C. W. Kirtland of Safford; H. S. Hansen of Coolidge; A. O. Bicknell, Tucson, president of Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Arthur J. Faul, chairman of Electrical District No. 2, Pinal County; Edward J. Farrell, chairman, Electrical District No. 3, Pinal County; and Edward Pretzer, chairman, Electric District No. 5, Pinal County.

14. Leading national newspapers favored the "backbone" system

Many of the Nation's leading newspapers, far removed from the West and local pressures, supported the Federal transmission system.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch said in an editorial: "The controversy over the upper Colorado project is, as we see it, not an ideological one of public versus private power. The question is how to develop most fully the power resources in which public funds are invested for public purposes. If the Federal Government is able to invest nine-tenths of the total cost to build the productive plant, it is certainly able, and has the obligation, to invest the remaining one-tenth for transmission lines to make sure that the product best serves the broad national purpose of resource development for which it was created."

The Washington Post declared: "There is no objection to private companies tying in marketing lines for consumers in the area. But should private companies be allowed to cream off the chief advantage of a public investment by acquiring control of the basic power grid? The plan approved by Congress in 1956 certainly did not provide for such an arrangement; instead it followed the existing pattern of Federal construction."

Similar comments were made in other sections of the country.

The Mesa Tribune, an independent daily in our own State, said: "Official actions of the (Mesa) council and of the (Salt River) project's governing board support public ownership of the lines. . . . The power at Glen Canyon will be produced by publicly owned utilities be allowed to establish a toll-gate for delivery of that power? Federal ownership of the power lines is in the best interest of the whole Nation as well as this area, when the long-range is considered."

Later, the Mesa Tribune added:

"Mayor Brown . . . took issue with statements of leaders in several northern areas of the State regarding the possible tax losses that political subdivisions in that section may incur because of Federal ownership of the lines. He pointed out that the lines will be built across nontaxable publicly owned lands for the most part and he also questioned the \$750,000 figure that has been widely quoted as the amount of taxes that would result from the lines being under private ownership."

CONCLUSION

I hope that those who have read this memorandum will better understand the complex factors which led me to vote as I did. Now that it is settled, let all Arizonans, including APSCO and the consumer-owned utilities, resolve their differences and unite in support of reclamation measures which will promote a successful future for our State.

Keith Worthington's History of Nephi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Nephi, Utah, settled in 1851, was named for the patriarch who in the Book of Mormon came with his family from Judea to the Americas in the time of the Babylonian captivity.

Nephi was fortified with a moated wall and its most important early event was the making of peace between Brigham Young and Chief Walker. Historians tell us that according to S. N. Carvalho, who was present, Young, accompanied by 50 mounted men and 100 wagon loads of curious settlers, came to Walker's camp. After a day of preliminary oratory and gifts, Walker began plaintively:

Sometimes Wakara take his young men and go far away to sell horses. When he is gone, Americats come kill his wife and children. Why no come fight when Wakara home?

But he concluded:

Wakara no want fight Mormonee. If Indian kill white man again, Wakara make Indian howl.

There was consistent peace until 1865 and Mr. Keith Worthington, of Nephi, Utah, picks up his next series of articles with the Walker war. These articles, printed by the Times News of Nephi, for the upcoming 110th anniversary, are as follows:

THE WALKER WAR

Following the early Indian skirmishes in 1849 at Battle Creek, now Pleasant Grove, peace prevailed among the Mormons and the natives. The Indians were learning to support themselves and the settlers were helping to support them until they could learn the ways of the white men. Both Martha Spence Heywood and W. A. C. Bryan tell of the friendly relations that existed between the saints and the Indians. Several of the Indians were baptized and became active members of the church. This friendly feeling was not to last, however.

In the early summer of 1853, trouble began to brew. Chief Walker and his braves began to attack the settlements. Quite a number of white people and many Indians were killed in these skirmishes. Several small settlements were broken up, among them the neighboring towns of Santaquin in Utah County and Spring City in Sanpete County. This made the citizens of Nephi on edge and necessitated strong guards being established and caused some hardship to the citizens. "We had to tear down some of our houses and move into closer quarters" said Bishop Bigler later, "It was necessary to do all our work in companies" (Brough, p. 70).

George A. Smith was given military power to put all the communities in order as he moved south. Nephi was put under military law on July 19, 1853. Maj. George Bradley was commanding (Mary Henderson, "Historic Sites and Landmarks," p. 167).

On this same day, the Deseret News reported: "On the 19th of July the Indians attempted to surprise the settlement on Pleasant Creek (Mount Pleasant) in the north part of Sanpete County, and stole horses and cattle at Manti and Nephi."

These actions brought on the fort-building era in Utah. It was not long until the

Nephites were also planning stronger and larger fortifications. This will be covered in detail later.

The Deseret News of October 1, 1863, told of the following encounter with Indians at Clover Creek (Mona) 9 miles north of Nephi: "An the 10th inst. at 20 minutes past 10 a.m. the Indians commenced firing on a party of 10 men, under command of Lt. R. Burns, who were encamped on Clover Creek, in Juab Valley, and continued firing until 40 minutes past 11, slightly wounding Isaac Duffin in the knee, killing 2 horses, and wounding one horse and several calves. In the morning Lieutenant Burns' party judged from the signs that they had killed two Indians, and wounded three."

As these depredations continued many people became vexed and wanted Brigham Young to retaliate through the Nauvoo Legion, which was the State militia, but Brother Brigham said:

"How many times have I been asked in the past week, what I intend to do with Walker. I say let him alone severely. I have not made war on the Indians, nor am I calculating to do it. My policy is to give them presents, and be kind to them, instead of being Walker's enemy. I have sent him a great pile of tobacco to smoke when he is lonely in the mountains. He is now at war with the only friends he has upon this earth, and I want him to have some tobacco to smoke." (I Cecil Alter, "Utah, the Storied Domain," vol. 1, p. 159).

Even with Brigham's advice to leave the Indians alone some few deviated from the course, much to the regret of the majority. Martha Spence Heywood tells of one such instance:

"The Saturday after Mr. Heywood left (for Salt Lake City) the San Pete brethren arrived here on their way to the city to attend conference and brought with them the bodies of three murdered brethren, by the Indians, out of four who started from Sanpete the day before the company did. They had not obeyed counsel in camping where they did that night. They were very much mutilated and the other one was found and brought in the next day.

"This barbarous circumstance actuated our brethren counseled by Father Morley of Sanpete (who no doubt was much excited in the time of it) and President Call of Fillmore, to do quite as barbarous an act the following morning, being the Sabbath. Nine Indians coming into our camp looking for protection and bread with us, because we promised it to them and without knowing they did the first evil act in that affair or any other, were shot down without 1 minute's notice."

Most of the Nephi people treated the Indians very well, however. Chief Walker seemed to have a lot of confidence in some of the Nephi brethren, particularly Father Cazier who gave Walker a patriarchal blessing and told him that if he learned of the Mormons, and to do as they did to cultivate the earth, etc., he would be blessed.

Sometime in the very early years of Nephi an Indian farm was established. Sister Heywood records, April 16, 1854, that: "Brother Jeremiah Hatch has located with us to supervise the Indian farm by appointment." On May 3, 1854, Sister Heywood records of a blessing being put upon the Indian farm by Father Cazier.

In May 1854, Chief Walker appealed to Brigham Young for peace. Juab Valley became the scene of the peace treaty at Chicken Creek (Levan). Daniel H. Wells gives an interesting account of the peace meeting:

"When we approached them, Walker was in his wickiup; he had fastened it down to within 4 feet of the ground, and we had to crawl to get in and out. I remember our having a good laugh at him because of this. He sat in this 'arrangement' like a

prince and never rose at all. He remarked through our interpreter that Brigham Young was a big chief and Walker was a big chief. Suiting the action to the word, he put his thumbs up to indicate that he was as big a chief as Brigham, and that Brigham was as big as he. In the treaty the Indians agreed to give up the stolen horses—at least all they had of them in their possession. Walker would not talk. He had a sick child. If this child died, someone else he thought, might die, and it was a long time before we got him to talk. He asked us to administer to the child (through prayer and laying on of hands) which we did. President Young asked him what he wanted in the way of presents. He said 'I don't know. You talk.' I think he was afraid he would say something less than President Young would give him. After this treaty, Walker became very friendly. He traveled with us to Cedar City and camped with us that night. He did this for our protection, featuring some of his Indians who did not know of the treaty might make a raid on us. We enjoyed good peace after that for several years (Bryant S. Hinckley, 'Daniel H. Wells').

BUILDING OF THE FORT WALL

As was mentioned in an earlier article, not long after Nephi was settled the people commenced to build a fort so that they would have protection from the Indians. This fort no doubt served the citizens very well until hostilities broke out with Walker. Then in 1853 a larger fort was started and for a time progressed very well, but just prior to the Walker Peace Treaty, the lack of Indian activities had lulled the Nephites to negligence. In fact, they ceased to work altogether.

Early in May, President Brigham Young and some of the brethren arrived in Nephi. They held a meeting in the schoolhouse and Brother Brigham reprimanded the people for not having better protection against the Indians. Sister Heywood says of this meeting: "Brother Brigham spoke and one of his remarks was that if the people did not obey council in building their fort and wall and securing themselves they would get their throats cut."

This spurred the people on in their building activity, but there was a difference of opinion as to whether they should build a fort or a wall or both. Many of the citizens objected to Brother Heywood and his counsel that they should only build a wall. They insisted that Brigham Young's counsel had been to build a fort and a wall.

A public meeting was held, and the people asked that Brother Heywood be removed from office and voted down his plan. Brother Andrew Love records in his journal:

"Sat. May 20, 1864: The house was full of spectators who all voted to sustain the council. At a public meeting held at 10 o'clock Bro. Heywood called for a vote of the people to sustain him in carrying out Pres. Young's plan in building a city wall, but he was voted down as the question was unfairly put. There was a little squabbling and cross firing in the afternoon and considerable division in camp."

Even after this there was no unanimity as to what they should do so another meeting was held. Four of the members of the quorum of the Twelve Apostles were there and listened to both cases. Hinckley records:

"After due consideration [they] decided that each party had gained their case and that constable should pay the costs. The Twelve counselled that the people should forgive Brother Heywood and that he also forgive the people who were asked to restate him and all begin anew."

Before the apostles dismissed the hearing, they discharged all the old committees and a new one was appointed. It consisted of Timothy B. Foote, Jacob G. Bigler, David Webb, Joseph L. Heywood, and George Ken-

dall. Under the advice and counsel of Brigham Young they built a wall around three square blocks, 12 feet high; 6 feet wide at the base tapering to 2 feet wide at the top. This was to be completed in 3 months. The area surrounded extends from second south and first west to first north, thence to second east, thence second south and then to the beginning at first west street.

For a time Walker objected to the wall and this slowed down the building considerably, but by November 20, 1854, it was reported that the city wall was "most of it up to 12 feet high, and the remainder about 9." The gates were hung, and had been locked on the night of the 18th, and the guards had been dismissed (The Deseret News, Nov. 20, 1854).

On November 30, 1854, the settlers appointed a day of feasting and merrymaking to celebrate the completion of the walls. Truly they had accomplished a great task.

The saints continued living inside the fort until 1860. In 1863 Love records that President Young had given instructions to level the fort wall:

"At 5 o'clock we assembled for a meeting in the new social hall where a full house was addressed by President Young and Kimball and Elders John Taylor and Lorenzo Snow. The instruction given was invaluable, advising the people to level down their old fort wall, enlarge their lots, beautify their homes, improve their orchards, and pleasant walks and still continue to add to their public improvements until a fine city should adorn the present site" (the Deseret News, Aug. 18, 1855).

By 1920 only a few traces of the wall remained, but in this year the four corners of the wall were marked with concrete monuments (McClune, "History of Juab County," p. 70). In 1935 the remaining piece of the wall was given a proper monument and is now preserved at the Nephi City Pioneer Memorial Park for all to see (the Times-News, Nov. 21, 1935).

RECREATION AND ENTERTAINMENT

We who enjoy the many modern inventions of today have a hard time visualizing the conditions which those early pioneers lived under. Their first light was the blaze of the fireplace, their first floors were often dirt, their water was obtained from the creek and irrigation ditches. Traveling was slow and arduous, the people having to go by horse, covered wagon or stagecoach. While the men worked on their farms and in the mountains, the womenfolk washed, carded, spun, and wove wool, making all their own clothing. They colored the cloth with sagebrush, dogwood, indigo, and perhaps other herbs. The stockings were knit. Rag carpets were made. Many of the farm implements were devised and made by the menfolk. Most everything worn or used was made and provided by these industrious people. A man of that day and age had to know how to do many things.

Probably one of the saddest parts of pioneer life was the lack of medical aid that they experienced. When someone became sick, no trained professional doctors or nurses were there to help. The people had to use the home remedies they had learned and hope for the best. Martha Spense Heywood gave a good description of the type of remedies that were used. When her little daughter was sick she gave her some saffron and sage tea. Then she bathed the child with saleratus water to bring out the rash. When her breathing became difficult, the child was given castor oil and anointed with consecrated oil and given some inwardly. Lobelia was also given to aid her breathing. When the breathing became much worse, Sister Heywood put onions under the child's arm and oiled her well. In spite of all this the child died.

Even though the pioneers who came into Juab Valley were very busy wrestling a living

from the soil, they found time to provide recreation and social activities for themselves. As early as March of 1852 Martha Spence Heywood mentioned a party and ball that she attended where mince and custard pies and fried cakes were served.

In December 1852, Sister Heywood records that "they had the first dance for this season on Friday night as a reward for getting the schoolhouse repaired."

In pioneer times people found it necessary to provide their own recreation, even though it had to be mixed up with more productive activities. Thus, if a housewife wished to make a quilt she would invite her neighbors to a "quilting." The guests would do the sewing and she would provide the food. In the evening after the men finished they would join the ladies in a dance.

Dancing was one of the most popular forms of recreation for the early settlers of Utah. At first the leaders discouraged anything but square and round dancing, but gradually other dances were introduced.

Housewarming parties were in order when new homes were completed. It answered two purposes: It offered a chance for an enjoyable visit among friends while the dancing helped to smooth the rough floorboards ("Nephi's Centennial Jubilee," p. 16).

In the winter, sleigh riding was one of the most pleasant pastimes for young and old. Young people would put a wagon box on a pair of "bobs," fill it with straw, blankets, themselves, and then with sleigh bells tinkling go speeding over the snow. Sometimes they would race with one another for excitement. In the summer, hay racks on wagons took the place of sleighs (ibid.).

Celebrations were a highlight in the pioneer's life. Even the hardest workingman in town would take time off to celebrate the 4th and 24th of July. A parade featuring all the dignitaries of the city, talks given by leading citizens, games for the youngsters, a banquet, and dance usually were the main features of the day.

After the social hall was built, drama became an important part of the community. Some of the early dramas played there were "Damon and Pythias," "Macbeth," "Merchant of Venice," "King Lear," and "Othello." We of today might do well to emulate this.

Music played a very vital part in the community. In 1853 William Minshall Evans was called and set apart by President Brigham Young to organize and conduct a choir. He served from that date until his death in 1877, with the exception of 1 year's leave of absence. There was no organ, so the choir sang a capella. Later violins furnished the accompaniment and in 1870 the first organ was purchased ("Nephi's Centennial Jubilee 1851-1951," p. 12, 13).

In 1857 the Deseret News wrote "There is an excellent choir at Nephi and the saints are justly proud of it." Often the choir was invited by President Young to accompany him on his trips to Sampete County and to southern Utah.

There is a discrepancy as to when the first brass band was organized in Nephi, the dates varying from 1854 to 1861, but there is no disagreement as to the quality of the band. It was one of the outstanding bands in the territory of Utah.

In 1865 a Deseret News correspondent traveling with Brigham Young's party as he journeyed to Salt Lake City, said of the band:

"A few miles south of Nephi the Presidency were met by an escort, and as we halted in front of Bishop Bryan's residence, an excellent brass band, number 12 intelligent-looking persons and led by Mr. Hawkins struck up a lively air, which cheered our spirits and made us forget somewhat the fatigue of 40 miles travel" (The Deseret News, June 25, 1865).

The journal history records in 1865: "At a meeting in Payson, the singing and music were beautifully executed by four good

choirs, from Springville, Spanish Fork, Payson, and Nephi and the excellent band from Nephi which accompanied the President on his southern trip last summer, and afforded so much harmonious gratification to the company and settlements through which they passed" (Journal history of the church, June 10, 1885).

Fairs, trials, baseball games, and debating societies were some of the other pastimes and activities that the early pioneers participated in and enjoyed.

SCHOOLS

Education for the children of the settlement was one of their first considerations—even before they had fully established their homes. Martha Spence Heywood wrote this description in her journal on May 2, 1852:

"Sunday. Had a meeting to regulate about the school and it was decided that school would commence forthwith engaging Canace Smith to teach at the rate of \$5 a week and board herself."

This woman was the first schoolteacher in Nephi. Other articles list Martha Heywood as the first teacher. This is in error, however. She soon was to become the second teacher. She explains it this way.

"To our great surprise we found that Candace left for Manti vacating her position after 6 weeks trial of it; she being somewhat dissatisfied with some of the people and the people being generally dissatisfied with her management as schoolteacher."

In another few weeks Sister Heywood was persuaded to teach the children the basic of an education. She had about 17 students.

There is not space to recount all of the schools that were set up in this early period, suffice it to say, many schools were established, most of them in homes or small buildings. As the valley grew in population larger schools were established and at the end of the pioneer period most children could obtain a good education to the eighth grade.

The journal history for the church gives the following statistics for Juab County in 1869 of which Juab Valley was the only inhabited area of any consequence:

"Juab County: 4 districts in county, 3 districts reported, 4 schools; 4 male teachers, 207 boys in county between 4 and 16 years, 239 girls in county between 4 and 16 years, 88 male scholars enrolled, 100 female scholars enrolled, 197 total enrolled; 44½ percent of names enrolled, 141 average daily attendance, 37½ percent of population actually attending school; \$1,200 paid to male teachers. Also total amount paid to teachers, 8½ months school has been taught during the year; \$1,000 building fund raised." (The Journal history of the church, February 19, 1869).

Surplus Food Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 15, the Honorable WALLACE BENNETT, Senator from Utah, spoke on the floor of the Senate concerning the distribution of surplus foods and inserted in the course of his remarks an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal. This article contained many references to the city of Corsicana, Tex.,

located within my congressional district. There were inferences of a widespread malpractice within the city under the program.

The Honorable Kenneth Douglas, county judge of Navarro County of which Corsicana is the county seat, wrote a letter to the President concerning this matter, and also wrote to an individual in New York City who had written to the city officials of Corsicana as a result of the article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include these letters and I trust they will help to clear up much of the misunderstanding and remove some of the clouds of doubt which have been cast over the city of Corsicana by a number of zealous newspapers and their reporters:

SEPTEMBER 12, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Much publicity has been given recently to the curtailing of the surplus food program in Navarro County. No doubt you have heard something about this, and I thought that you might be interested in the following explanation.

A few weeks ago, the commissioners court of Navarro County, voted to reduce the number of recipients on the surplus food rolls, as a result of a local problem. The court felt that due to the fact that the farmers needed workers in the fields, it was necessary for a time, to curtail the number of recipients. Mention of the fact was carried in the local paper. The Dallas Morning News then mentioned it in their paper. Others, including the Wall Street Journal, took up the story and much of the article was distorted facts. We are Democrats and are very much in favor of this program and feel that it is a very worthwhile one, but during the summer when some of the farm laborers were needed so badly on the farms, we had to do something to ease the situation for the farmers. It is strictly a local affair and we did not desire nor did we dream that there would be any publicity given to the action. As a result, we have had inquiries, one of which was made by a representative of a nationwide manufacturing plant, who asked if the statements made in the Wall Street Journal were accurate. A copy of the letter which I wrote him is attached to this letter. Only the name and address of the addressee have been removed, as a courtesy to him.

Actually it is our opinion that this publicity is not written as a news story, but more as a slap at the Kennedy administration. Therefore, even though you are now going through a very trying time with the critical world events, it is my feeling that some of this publicity has reached you and I wanted you to know the facts as they are and not as they have been reported.

I might further add that politics has never extended into the surplus food program in Corsicana, but if there was an occasion for Navarro County's problem to be mixed in with politics, most of the members of the two organizations that originally asked us to enter into the program, are generally classified as conservative in their political philosophy.

I appreciate the fact that you are busy but because we do feel that you are putting forth every effort to help the needy, and because we are in sympathy with your program, I wanted you to have this explanation.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH A. DOUGLAS,
County Judge, Navarro County.

Your plant manager and a good friend of mine, and I had a cup of coffee a few days ago and ——— advised me that you had inquired with reference to the accuracy of an article in the Wall Street Journal recently. I asked ——— if he objected for me to write you explaining the circumstances and also explaining that part of the article that is true and that part which is not true. I would like to give you all of the facts and I hope that you have the time to read them.

Primarily, the responsibility of taking care of the people who are unable to take care of themselves, is the responsibility of each individual county in our State. Navarro County is very fortunate in this respect because we have several charitable trusts with assets of several million dollars. These trusts are used for the betterment of this county and the funds are also used to take care of many who, for various reasons, become unable to take care of themselves. This is true—not only for food, lodging, clothing, but also for their medical needs when needed. The Family Service is a Community Chest organization operating exclusively inside the limits of Corsicana. This is an organization composed of 29 board members with 1 full-time employee and with 5 volunteer workers, who investigate applicants for their funds and do extensive investigation for the above charitable trusts. The Salvation Army does the same service outside the limits of Corsicana that the Family Service does inside. Our Salvation Army has a local board consisting of 20 members.

These two organizations, along with church groups and other local associations, had always taken care of the food for the needy until the early part of this year. During the latter part of 1960 and the early months of 1961, the economic situation in this county was comparable to the economic situation of the United States as a whole. During the early months of 1961, the Commissioners Court of Navarro County, the administrative agency for the county, met with the boards of directors for the two above-mentioned organizations for the purpose of discussing the surplus food program and the possibility of Navarro County entering into the program. Each of the two organizations were being hard pressed for money and each felt that if there was a way that the county could relieve them of the responsibility of purchasing food for the needy, then each organization could utilize their funds for the other necessities. It was felt at the time that the general economic situation would change later to where most people in need and physically able to work, would be able to secure work and the program could be curtailed. Later a formal public meeting was held by the court, at which time members of the two boards appeared before the court and publicly sought its help in setting up the surplus food program. The court did vote to enter into the program but agreed that we would reexamine the program at the end of the first 3-month period. Later there were some complaints about the program, such as the one by Mr. Allen, as stated in the Wall Street Journal. There were a few other complaints similar to this one but certainly none that would justify the national publicity that was given to Navarro County, as a result of the court's changing the requirements for the recipients of the surplus food.

I might add that I talked to one farmer with extensive cotton acreage who told me that he was having trouble in getting farm labor. I talked to another the same day whose cotton acreage is as extensive and who was experiencing no trouble. Certainly, I cannot explain the difference, however, I am sure that in Navarro County, as in other places, there are a number of people who would not work when there is work avail-

able. I am of the opinion that Navarro County has no more of these people than does any other area, on a percentage basis.

It was felt by the commissioners' court, which is composed of the county judge (which is me) as chairman and four men—all of whom have been elected by the county and each commissioner representing a different section of the county—that the economic situation in Navarro County would justify, at least temporarily, the cutting down on the surplus food until at least October or until that time when most of the farmwork has been completed. The commissioners' court actually anticipated no particular publicity as a result of this move, but it is my opinion that the Dallas Times Herald actually brought about all of this publicity—whether adverse or otherwise.

Our daily newspaper carried the story. An abbreviated version of same was carried in the Dallas Morning News—but the Times Herald carried the story on its front page with an excerpt which compared this curtailment to the Newburgh, N.Y., story. The Dallas Morning News then sent a reporter here, who wrote the story on same which was, in my opinion, generally accurate. Then the Wall Street Journal sent a reporter to Corsicana. There are more statements untrue in the account in the Journal article than there are true statements. I am looking at a copy of the story now and will give you my honest opinion on each of the paragraphs.

Paragraph 1 is completely false. We are not necessarily a small cotton country town. We may appear to be so to some outsider from the neighboring community of Dallas, Tex. You are probably well aware of the fact that Corsicana has several industries and even though a large part of the income here is from agriculture, a great percentage is from business and industries that are located in the county. Agricultural labor is no longer in demand as it was in former years. The farming in this county is highly mechanized. We Corsicanans feel that we have a very fine city and we certainly do not feel that we are a small cotton town. Business is no better and no worse than it is in any other community of similar size in the United States. I have lived in this county all of my life and it is very seldom that by 9 a.m. our streets downtown are choked with honking cars—but I wish that by 9 a.m. of every day the second sentence of paragraph 1 would be true.

However, in paragraph 2, that sentence is connected to the surplus food program and how any reporter can possibly hope to verify that statement that I made when applying it to the surplus food program—is more than I can understand. I have seen traffic around the warehouse where the commodities are distributed and I have seen the lines of hungry people who are waiting their turn. This warehouse is located away from the main streets of Corsicana and there is plenty of parking space nearby. Even though we are issuing commodities to some 3,200 people, there were no 3,200 people standing in line waiting for those supplies. The 3,200 people would represent probably some 500 to 600 families at the most. Two days were set aside for issuance, so there would probably be some 300 people in line each of the 2 days. I am at a loss to understand how this could take all of the parking space in the city of Corsicana.

"Mr. Kennedy's mule and goober grease" are words never heard in Navarro County, at least by me, until I read the Wall Street Journal. I told Mr. Moffett of the Journal that in my opinion, the rapid spurt in the number of persons receiving free food was not attributed to the fancier fare provided by the Kennedy administration but the reason

for this increase was because more people were learning that they were eligible. I do not believe that any Navarro County official made the statement, and I quote "that this beef and gravy deal has been nothing but a headache since it started." However, there have been numerous problems connected with the program as there would be with any new program public or private.

I did not say that we are attempting to reduce future food distribution to about 1,000 persons per month. Navarro County voted to remain in the program for the fiscal year, beginning September 1, 1961, and it was necessary that we use some figure, because we are required to pay 30 cents per person per month. We used the figure 1,000 because it was a nice round figure, however, we later cut that figure down to 750 recipients.

The statement that Federal officials have not protested is, in my opinion, simply a statement made to make it appear that our Federal officials are trying to tell us in Navarro County how to handle our county's business. I do not think the Federal Government would even think of protesting and what Federal official would make the protest—should one be made?

I have been unable to verify the statement attributed to Mr. L. B. Avery, a farm laborer. I have not as yet been able to find anyone that knows Mr. Avery. He is not on the rolls as a recipient of surplus foods. I do not know to what he was referring when he said "people ain't going to get the grass hoed out of the cotton because we ain't going to do it"—because the farmers did get the grass out by the farm laborers in this county. I did not know that any of our merchants had gone into the business of selling cardboard boxes. Anytime that I need a cardboard box, for any reason, all that I do is to go to the rear of some business place and pick up a discarded box.

Actually, the reporters that have discussed this matter with me seem to think that the problem in Navarro County is a similar problem that exists all over the United States. This may or may not be true but the way the surplus food program is handled, especially here in Texas, it is the responsibility of the individual county to make its own rules and regulations and what may be good for one county may not necessarily be good for another. The Federal Government does set a maximum limitation on income and resources, but the minimums and the maximums as set by each county may be far below that set by the Federal Government. It is my opinion that Navarro County and Corsicana are very fine places in which to live and we are quite proud of them. We are also very proud of all our industries located in the county that contribute to the economic well-being of the county. We are particularly proud of the part that — plays and we certainly hope that the feeling is mutual. We object to any false publicity that casts a degrading reflection on the county or the city, however, we have no control over what any newspaper reporter may say in order to prepare his story. I would think though, that a reporter should attempt to be fair, impartial and objective—but Mr. Moffett with the Wall Street Journal evidently does not believe in this type of reporting.

I trust that this answers the question that you asked of — and even though the answer is lengthy, I felt that it was necessary to answer in this manner rather than to give a "yes" or "no" answer.

Thanking you for taking the time to read this explanation, I am,

Very truly yours,

KENNETH A. DOUGLAS,
County Judge, Navarro County, Tex.

Fiftieth Anniversary of New Jersey Jewish Welfare Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the National Jewish Welfare Board had served our Nation in many ways for many years. Its work is well known to hospitalized veterans and servicemen; it has helped organize or guide more than 350 Jewish Y and community centers in the United States.

In my home State, the New Jersey section of the National Jewish Welfare Board is now celebrating its 50th anniversary. Our State unit actually antedates the national organization; it has achieved a magnificent record of accomplishment since 1911.

An article in the September 10 issue of the Newark Sunday News describes its achievements. In doing so, it provides a valuable record of the work done by a vital, growing, and essential organization in New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY JEWISH WELFARE UNIT OBSERVES
50TH ANNIVERSARY
(By Audrey A. Fecht)

The New Jersey section of the National Jewish Welfare Board, dedicated to serving hospitalized veterans and servicemen as well as the young and old at home through Jewish community centers, celebrates its 15th birthday this year.

The milestone is being observed at founders' night programs at YM-YWHA's and community centers throughout the State during the year. An essay contest, which closes October 10, also is being conducted for teenagers on what they receive and give to their Y's and centers.

The State group is actually a senior citizen in service compared to the national organization. The forerunner of the New Jersey section was founded in 1911 as the Young Men's Hebrew Associations of New Jersey, according to Sigmund Taft, Jewish Welfare Board field secretary.

In 1913 the National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations was organized by leaders of American Jewry, including such outstanding New Jersey residents as Louis Bamberger and Felix Fuld, Newark businessmen, and Abram L. Elkus of Red Bank, onetime U.S. Ambassador to Turkey. He also was the father of Mrs. Katharine Elkus White, acting State treasurer and chairman of the New Jersey Highway Authority.

FORMED IN 1917

The National Jewish Welfare Board itself was formed in 1917 to meet the World War I religious and welfare needs of Jews in the Armed Forces. It merged with the National Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations 4 years later.

Thus since 1921 Jewish Welfare Board has served the double functions of giving leadership and direction to the Jewish Y and com-

munity centers and of helping members of the Armed Forces and hospitalized veterans both in war and peace. In connection with its work for the Armed Forces, Jewish Welfare Board also is a member of the USO.

Through its national and field staff of experts Jewish Welfare Board provides technical help and guidance to more than 350 Jewish Y and community centers in the United States which are financially autonomous. In New Jersey more than 90,000 persons of all ages, from preschool children to senior citizens, participate in the many cultural, educational, athletic and social programs of Y and community centers. Under the New Jersey Section of Jewish Welfare Board summer camps also are operated for boys, girls and teenagers at Milford, Pa., with a special camping period assigned to senior citizens.

PURPOSES OF PROGRAMS

The purpose of these programs, Taft explained, is to meet the varied needs of the individual, whether he's a rambunctious child, a talented teenager seeking a means to develop leadership qualities and special skills, or a lonely and forgotten oldtimer. Whatever the age group and activity involved, Taft added, Y programs are practical democracy in action.

To achieve its objectives highly trained professional personnel are needed, Taft observed, and most staff members of New Jersey Jewish Y's and community centers have master's degrees in social work. Jewish Welfare Board also sponsors a program of scholarships, fellowships and work-study grants to foster the increase of qualified personnel.

At East Orange and Lyons Veterans' Hospitals and military installations throughout New Jersey, Jewish Welfare Board volunteer workers are familiar figures. For hospitalized veterans they give ward parties, sponsor outings and perform a variety of personal services.

The aim of Jewish Welfare Board service to members of the Armed Forces and their families is to make them feel they are part of the community where they are stationed and to make certain they are not forgotten by their hometowns, Mrs. Srager added.

Through its chaplaincy program the organization also provides for the religious needs of servicemen and hospitalized veterans.

Jewish Welfare Board ships a variety of articles, ranging from books, records and films to religious items, to chaplains at isolated bases in this country and abroad for distribution to servicemen.

"Ham" Operator Ends Long Vigil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD B. McSWEEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, the remarkable performance of Mr. Julius J. Saucier, "ham" radio operator of Pineville, La., is related in the September 13 issue of the Alexandria, La., Daily Town Talk. The article follows:

"HAM" OPERATOR ENDS LONG VIGIL

Julius J. Saucier, Pineville amateur radio operator, ended a 100-hour-long vigil at 10 p.m. Tuesday after helping dispatch over 500 emergency messages about Hurricane Carla.

He had just shut down his 1,000-watt transmitter at 1 p.m. Tuesday when he was asked to control traffic pertaining to the tornado in Hodge. Emergency work was completed at 10 p.m.

Saucier operated the control station located in his Wardville home at 119 Hickory Street for a network of over 100 amateur stations (ham radio stations) from 3 p.m. Friday until Carla had lost much of its punch Tuesday afternoon and normal communications facilities had been restored for emergency work.

He logged over a thousand stations in a five- or six-State area, working mainly with Texas and Louisiana stations.

His station, W5GKT, also cooperated with news gathering media in bringing firsthand reports from areas hit by the storm. Weather bulletins were rebroadcast regularly throughout the watch to keep all areas advised of what to expect.

During the period from 3 p.m. Friday until 1 p.m. Tuesday, Saucier only managed 7 or 8 hours of sleep.

His wife, also an amateur operator with her own radio station, spelled him on several times but caring for their five children did not leave her much time for radio work, Saucier said today.

Almost voiceless after the ironman vigil, Saucier said, other Alexandria-Pineville hams came to help him Tuesday evening easing the burden of handling tornado traffic.

Washington's Farm Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the September 20, 1961, issue of the Wall Street Journal. I am placing this commentary in the RECORD for I believe it deserves the attention of all who are interested in our farm economy.

WASHINGTON'S FARM WONDERLAND

The wonders of the administration's new farm program are beginning to unfold. And to at least some farmers it undoubtedly does seem like a wonderful racket.

To wit: With mandatory acreage reductions for corn and other feed grains, Secretary Freeman figured this year's output at around 125 million tons down from about 156 million tons last year. Since that would be less than demand, the Government could make up the difference from its bundle of surplus feed grains, estimated at 75 million tons, and thus finally make a dent in the mountainous excess.

Unfortunately for Mr. Freeman, good weather and farmer ingenuity are conspiring to boost yields perhaps as much as they would have been without the acreage cuts. Hence it looks as though the \$750 million he—that is, the taxpayer—is paying farmers to reduce acreage of corn and sorghum grains will be for nothing.

So far, it's a fairly familiar tale of nature and human nature outwitting the farm experts in Washington, but that's not all. With some groggy notion of further "stabilizing" prices, the Department is offering surplus corn at the market price, which has been around \$1.04 a bushel, while the price-prop payment is \$1.20 a bushel.

This means the farmer can put practically his whole corn crop into the Government bins at the higher price and buy Govern-

ment surplus corn at the lower price. You can't hardly beat that.

Oh yes—a couple of other interesting little ramifications. The cheap corn for the farmer may well lead to a new glut in hog production with the possibility of a big slump in livestock prices.

And already the abundance of cheap feed is causing cows to turn out more milk—now about 5 percent more than the record output of a year ago. Since the public couldn't drink all that without floating away, more and more milk is going into butter and cheese which are going into (three guesses) the Government surpluses. Just from last April the Government bought 189 million pounds of butter, compared with 82 million pounds in the like previous period, and 63 million pounds of cheese, compared with only 165,000 pounds in the previous period.

So you can readily see how wonderful it is when our masters in Washington start stabilizing things and getting them all straightened out for us incompetent citizens.

Storm Over the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from the New York Times, Wednesday, September 20, 1961, entitled "Storm Over the U.N."

STORM OVER THE U.N.

The United Nations General Assembly met yesterday under the dark shadow of the tragic death of Secretary General Hammarskjöld that left this world organization like a ship without a captain in a storm-tossed sea of a double crisis—its own and that of the world. Its first task is to organize itself, to find some way to fill the gaping void in the top command post, in order that it may proceed with the business at hand. This business includes all the great issues of world politics, the conduct of the war in the Congo—that is not going too well for the United Nations—and the problem of finance that threatens the United Nations with bankruptcy.

In these circumstances it is doubly welcome that President Kennedy has decided to go before the Assembly in person and in his role as spokesman for the Western World to do three things. The first and foremost is to pledge to the United Nations our continued and unwavering support in this time of trouble so it may continue to work for peace and for the suppression of aggression and thus save future generations from the scourge of war.

The second is to give renewed backing to the appointment of a single Secretary General to succeed Mr. Hammarskjöld and to warn all members, especially the "non-aligned," against the Soviet "troika" plan of a veto-laden three-headed directorate which, as the late Secretary General said in his last report that has now become his testament, would mean the collapse of the United Nations. The third is to lay before the Assembly a new and comprehensive American plan for general and complete disarmament, including a nuclear test ban, under effective control with "neutralist" participation.

But, as Foreign Minister Gromyko makes plain, the Soviets are determined to take

advantage of Mr. Hammarskjöld's death to precipitate an immediate battle for their "troika" plan. This would require an amendment of the charter which he also couples with the prior admission of Communist China. The assembly thus faces an immediate conflict which would not only delay action on the other nearly one hundred items on its agenda but would also becloud the projected talks between Mr. Gromyko and Secretary Rusk on the burning problem of Germany and Berlin.

One hopeful ray to pierce the prevailing gloom is the resumption of truce talks between President Tshombe of Katanga and a United Nations delegation now headed by Mr. Khilari of Tunisia. As another Tunisian, Mongi Slim, is slated to be elected President of the Assembly and is also being boosted as temporary Acting Secretary General, Tunisia is suddenly confronted with great responsibility in guiding the United Nations through the storm.

Washington Correspondent, Samuel Shaffer, Finds Beauty and Enjoyment in Family Vacation in West Virginia—Predicts State's Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has often been my responsibility to bring to the attention of this body some of the more distressing aspects of economic life in West Virginia, in order that corrective action be taken.

At other times I have had the occasion to point to the underlying values of a positive nature—the strength of our people, the rich natural resources of our State, and the unparalleled beauty of the scenery of West Virginia. This is such a time, when I can offer the unsolicited testimony of an experienced traveler and observer who is known personally to most of the Members of this body—Samuel Shaffer, the congressional correspondent of Newsweek.

Mr. Shaffer has recently returned from a month's vacation with his family in the State parks of West Virginia, and his praise for our "land overlooked" is so eloquent and heartfelt that I would do his comments an injustice were I to paraphrase them.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Samuel Shaffer's unsolicited letter to me and my letter in response.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSWEEK,

Washington, D.C., September 12, 1961.
The Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator, West Virginia.

DEAR JENNINGS: Thanks to your suggestion my family and I have just spent the most enjoyable vacation of our lives—a month in the State parks of West Virginia.

To be candid with you, the beauty of the parks, the excellence of the accommodations, the dedication of duty and the courtesy to

visitors displayed by park personnel far, far exceeded my expectations.

In driving along back country roads, selected almost at random, I beheld breathtaking vistas for which I was wholly unprepared by imagination or description by others.

It is unfortunate that West Virginia is linked in so many minds with poverty and distress. I think the time will surely come when Americans will think of the State as one of the most beautiful in the Union, as it unquestionably is.

West Virginia has a great future in tourism. It can become, and deserves to become, the playground of the Nation. And certainly the Nation could take pride in a people who could build such beautiful parks for its citizens to enjoy and to share with others.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL SHAFFER,
Congressional Correspondent.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., September 19, 1961.

Mr. SAMUEL SHAFFER,
Congressional Correspondent,
Newsweek,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SAM: Thanks so much for your good letter of September 12. I characterize it as good because you are so right about the potentials in West Virginia for becoming a national playground and a center of outdoor recreation. I agree most heartily that tourism holds great promise as a major factor in an invigorated economy in our State.

Personally, I am delighted that the Shaffers had a rewarding vacation in our scenic and historic State—a land overlooked too often by the tourist traveler. It is satisfying and stimulating, Sam, for work-weary folk to exchange for a few days or weeks their tedious tasks for the exhilarating journeys which refresh physical bodies and renew lagging spirits.

I'll wax philosophic for a paragraph by saying that a change of scene works wonders for those men and women whose day by day assignments become so deep they seem like dungeons. Schedules, which are like straitjackets, are ripped away as we open wide the doors to the roads beyond. On cushioned tires, over singing rails of steel, in sturdy ships at sea, on graceful wings of flight, I bless those happy travelers who return to their journalistic endeavors and their homes with minds and souls restored.

Best to you always.

Sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

General Eisenhower Reminds Us of the Difference Between the Republican and Democratic Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, too often there are those who try to sell the country on the idea that there is no difference between our two great political parties. Such a theory is harmful to both parties and to the country. There is a basic difference between the two parties and we should lose no opportunity to make this difference clear so

that the people may always have a choice in philosophies. Our former great President, Dwight Eisenhower, said it all in one statement last weekend in Chicago, the basic difference is that the Republicans have "faith in the individual." The following editorial comment from the Christian Science Monitor brings home the importance of the statement:

FAITH IN THE INDIVIDUAL

Republicans, casting about for central ground on which to tackle the 1962 election, could well consider the basic tenet urged by Dwight Eisenhower in his speech to the Dirksen dinner in Chicago. "Faith in the individual" is the basis, he said.

The man who drew support from so many sections of his party declared that this "simple faith" could unite Nixon, Rockefeller and Goldwater Republicans. Indeed he insisted that for those holding it doctrinal differences became as "ripples in a cup of tea compared with hurricane . . . waves of conflict" creating cleavages among Democrats. He supported this estimate with the failure of a heavily Democratic Congress to carry through much of the administration program.

The Democratic divisions are very visible—especially between presidential elections. But Republicans will not safely overlook the fact that several major Kennedy bills carried in Congress only because a decisive handful of Republicans gave them support. Much remains to be done to hammer out in party councils a working formula for applying faith in the individual to specific issues.

There is vitality in the faith, and it is directly related to the appeal Mr. Eisenhower made for rededication to "justice, individual liberty, and human dignity"—ideals on which the Nation's spiritual strength was built. This task is the responsibility—and opportunity—for each citizen, of whatever party.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Proclamation 3429 of the President of the United States on General Pulaski's Memorial Day, October 11, 1961:

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT—PROCLAMATION 3429—GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY, 1961, BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

Whereas the 182d anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski during the American Revolution brings to mind the heroic contribution of that great Polish patriot to the cause of our freedom and independence; and

Whereas General Pulaski's brilliant leadership and courage at Brandywine, Charleston, and Savannah deserve the everlasting admiration and gratitude of our Nation; and

Whereas our country owes much also to the loyalty and enterprising spirit of millions of our citizens of Polish descent; and

Whereas it is fitting that we acknowledge our debt to General Pulaski and his country-

men and honor the memory of the gallant Polish patriot:

Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate Wednesday, October 11, 1961, as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and I direct the appropriate officials of the Federal Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on that day.

I also invite the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in honor of the memory of General Pulaski and the noble cause for which he gave his life.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 18th day of September in the year of our Lord 1961 and of the independence of [SEAL] the United States of America the 186th.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

By the President:

CHESTER BOWLES,
Acting Secretary of State.

The Penalty for Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of September 19, 1961:

THE PENALTY FOR ILLUSION

The United Nations General Assembly will begin its meetings in the somber atmosphere generated by the death of Secretary General Hammarskjöld. Whatever one's disagreements with him, he worked indefatigably, by his lights and within the structures of his office, to ease the world's chronic troubles. Not the least tribute to him is that in doing so he earned the enmity of the Soviet Union.

Yet Mr. Hammarskjöld's death, however tragic, should not obscure the deeper crisis in which the United Nations finds itself; the symptoms may well start showing up in this session. In particular it is imperative for the United States to start facing the facts about the U.N., for the U.N. is turning into a threat to U.S. interests.

The organization was founded on the gigantic illusion that the Soviets would cooperate in the construction of a peaceful world. No sensible person could believe that myth for very long, but it has bedeviled the U.N. from the beginning. Today, moreover, other illusions have piled up in the East River edifice, and they too are potentially dangerous.

There is, notably, what might be called the illusion of parity. According to this fantasy, every nation is the peer of every other nation; an African area with less people than a good-sized American city, and without even the minimum qualifications of nationhood, has just as much voting power as the United States.

Such an approach to world problems has no basis in fact. In the real world, a nation must earn the right to influence international affairs. It may do so by coercive development and brute force, as in the Soviet Union; or it may do so by free economic and spiritual development, as in the Amer-

ican tradition. But in any case, a nation should not become an arbiter of world events simply by proclaiming itself a nation.

The practical consequences of upside-down thinking about the U.N. are rapidly becoming clear. For one, the United States gets swept into—and must bear the financial burden for—enterprises of questionable merit. Is it in the U.S. interest for the U.N. to attack pro-Western Katanga, which incidentally was not about to attack the central Congolese Government? Is it in the U.S. interest to have pro-Communists cropping up in responsible positions in the Congo?

More basically, there is the ugly situation confronting the United States in the General Assembly. For years we enjoyed an almost automatic majority in these deliberations; today, with the influx of all these newly-independent nations, with their professedly neutralist stance, we are increasingly in danger of being in an almost automatic minority.

The most striking current illustration is Washington's confession that it can no longer be sure of staying off discussion of the admission of Communist China. Suppose that in due course the Assembly votes that regime in; what then does the United States do? How much good is a Security Council veto if the weight of Assembly "opinion" is against the United States?

Or to consider the even more immediate question of a successor to Mr. Hammarskjöld, what guarantee can there be that the new Secretary General will be tolerable to the United States, or that under his aegis we will not be pulled into still worse adventures? In its present frame of mind, the U.S. Government might not even veto the recommendation of some neutralist or worse for the post. It is not difficult to foresee many other situations where the U.N. can menace U.S. interests.

With such a prospect, the United States in time may well be forced to consider whether it can remain in the organization. Short of that, the United States must, we believe, begin refashioning its thinking about the U.N. It must seek to use its power within the U.N. to effect its objectives, and it must steer clear of U.N. activities counter to those objectives.

The United States must finally abandon any sentimental notion of the U.N. as an inherently noble institution to which we are committed no matter what. In this connection, it wouldn't be a bad idea for the schools to stop teaching our children to believe in that falsehood.

What matters is the preservation of the United States, not the United Nations. If the two are becoming irreconcilable, we had better realize it. In the real world of power politics, the penalty is heavy for building a storehouse of illusions.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the untimely passing of our friend and colleague, OVERTON BROOKS, came as a blow to all of us. Having served with him for many years on the House Armed Services Committee, I learned to appreciate his keen understanding of the many ramifications of our national defense problems. He always had a contribution

to make in efforts to solve difficult problems that arose. His handiwork is reflected in many legislative acts that are vital to the defense and security of this country. More recently he served with distinction on the Committee on Space and Astronautics, of which he was chairman.

OVERTON BROOKS was a man of high ideals and possessed those sterling qualities of leadership and courage which marked his career. He was indeed an able man, and he served his country well.

I join with my colleagues in this expression of deep sympathy for his family in their bereavement.

Labor Sunday Address by Representative Rhodes, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues' attention the inspiring Labor Sunday address by Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania, to the Kuendig Memorial Bible Class in St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church in Reading, Pa., which was broadcast over Reading station WEEU on September 3, 1961. On that occasion Mr. RHODES spoke with clarity and insight concerning the unfinished business and goals of the American labor movement, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR SUNDAY MESSAGE

Ladies and gentlemen, I welcome the opportunity on this Labor Sunday to speak on a matter of great importance to all who are concerned about the dangers that surround us and about our responsibilities and our duties as citizens of a free society.

These are serious and challenging times, as we all can agree. We live in a land of great opportunity. We are divinely blessed as a Nation with great wealth and great natural and human resources. Vast surpluses and abundance of food and other essentials of life offer more than enough for all. As a Nation we have great productive power. We have the know-how to do the things that should be done.

Yet we face in this country of ours serious shortages in such important areas as school classrooms, hospital beds, highways, conservation, recreation, sewer and sanitary systems, health centers, and other public services.

Over 5 million citizens are unemployed in our country, despite all the work that needs to be done. Over the years, this heavy unemployment represents untold billions of dollars in lost productivity and a waste of human and natural resources that is too staggering to estimate.

Many of our most talented youth are being denied educational opportunities for the lack of school facilities or because their families cannot afford to pay for a college education. This terrible waste of brainpower is unjusti-

fiable, particularly because it is so important to our Nation's security and survival that we develop the best talent in our youth.

Many of our fellow men in these United States are in distress. Many are in need, despite great surpluses and waste. One-fifth of our population, about 30 million people, live on incomes that are below a decency level. In our own Berks County there are 10,000 jobless who seek employment in vain. It is the aged, the handicapped, and racial minorities who suffer most. But the victims of unemployment include many who are strong and healthy. How in good conscience can we ignore their plight? These are matters of much concern to labor people. Labor unionists are close to this problem and are constantly seeking legislation to correct this condition.

These problems also concern the church, for all over the Nation today on this Labor Sunday the country's major religious faiths are urging a cooperative approach to these problems.

Enlightened and dedicated leaders of both labor and management join in recognition of the need for mutual understanding, good will and the application of Christian principles to labor-management relations, and to the social and economic problems which confuse and divide us.

True, there are basic labor-management problems such as organizational rights, union security, collective bargaining, strikes, lockouts, and violence, over which there is much controversy and conflict.

In recent years, however, much progress has been made in collective bargaining and in avoiding lockouts and strikes. But much remains to be done. Strikes are very costly to both sides. Often many persons who are only indirectly involved are adversely affected. Major strikes often result in public inconvenience and at times affect vital public services. No one likes strikes, least of all those directly involved. The only remedy is good will, mutual trust and cooperation between labor and management.

The right to organize is universally recognized, yet it is the denial of this right which is responsible for much of the violence and strife in labor-management disputes.

Industrial conflict is a sort of civil war which we can ill afford today when the whole world seems to be on fire. Our own security and survival calls for cooperative effort between labor and management and a recognition of the common interests we all share in an enlightened, united and prosperous nation.

It is, however, on social and economic problems, and proposals for their solution where organized labor groups come into sharpest conflict with organizations of management. It is labor's influence for social and economic reform that causes management groups to object to political action by labor unions.

It is a conflict of political philosophy which fundamentally has to do with the distribution of our national wealth and income and how well and how fairly the average citizen shares in our Nation's productivity and wealth. It is the glaring inequities and the wide gap in incomes that lead to most of our troubles.

This was recognized in the first Labor Sunday message issued for use in Protestant churches back in 1917. Since 1950, Labor Sunday has been sponsored by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States. Labor Sunday messages have made a valuable contribution to better understanding and good will, and have strengthened our free way of life. These messages have given renewed moral and spiritual strength to working people and to labor and management leaders.

On this Labor Sunday, in messages from leaders of the three major religious faiths in our country, comes again the recognition

of this problem. These religious leaders have again called for a cooperative approach to the problems that beset labor and management—problems in which government also shares a vital interest, and problems which directly or indirectly affect us all.

There is much similarity between the objectives of the church and the social and economic programs advocated by labor. I am sure that every sincere, honest, and dedicated union member can subscribe to the statement adopted by the Fourteenth Biennial Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America made back in 1944.

The church proclaims Christian principles that provide a complete and perfect solution for labor-management problems which are really human problems. It recognizes serious tensions in the field of human relationships. The Lutheran 1944 statement, presented these principles, commending consideration particularly by labor leaders, industrialists and all those directly responsible for the well-being, prosperity and peace of our Nation.

Let me quote a few of these basic principles as pronounced by the Lutheran Church in its statement on labor.

God's moral order recognizes no class system. In His sight, all men are of eternal worth. He is no respecter of persons.

In God's sight every calling, however high or humble, which contributes to human welfare, is sacred and has His blessing.

God has abundantly provided the resources of the earth, primarily for human benefit. Possessions are a sacred trust to be used not for selfish materialistic ends, but for human betterment, today, and in future generations.

God expects all to share the burdens of daily life. He requires the strong, the privileged and the able to help the less privileged and the weak.

On duties and rights, the Lutheran message on Labor proclaims it is the duty of all men to work. It is the duty of all Christian men to so organize their relationships that everyone may have an opportunity for gainful employment.

It is the duty of every man to provide an adequate living for himself and his dependents. It is the duty of Christian men to so order their economic relationships that, in a world where God has provided "enough and to spare" for all, every man who is worthy and willing to work may obtain an adequate living for himself and his dependents.

The social order should be so organized as to secure and protect every man in the rightful possession and enjoyment of the fruits of his industry.

It is the duty of every man to develop to the maximum, through education and training the abilities with which God has endowed him. It should be the goal of a Christian social order to provide maximum opportunities for the education and training of all its members.

It is the duty and right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. The social order should guarantee to every man complete freedom of worship.

It is the duty of every man to cooperate in the establishment and maintenance of Government so that maximum civil liberties may be enjoyed by all with equal protection for all under the law without discrimination as to race, color or creed.

It is the right of every man freely to set up and to maintain, in cooperation with his fellow man, such forms of health and accident insurance, provision for medical care, unemployment relief and insurance, and old-age pensions as will provide security against the hazards of life.

According to the Lutheran message this is what the church must do to insure the performance of these duties and rights in hu-

man society. It says the church in a practical way should:

Champion the just cause of every man, regardless of his social status.

Advocate that service to society be regarded as the standard of social worth.

Proclaim always that the only cure for human selfishness and greed which are the common sources of industrial controversy is the Christian spirit of sacrifice for the greater good, growing out of love for God who desires men to live in a spirit of unselfish brotherhood.

Insist that democracy in industry is the only foundation for economic well-being.

Seek to develop in the church and community mutual understanding and good will between various groups.

Protest the use of force, violence, and sabotage by either labor or management in industrial disputes.

Encourage the promotion of community clinics, and such other cooperative enterprises as are conducive to human betterment.

Encourage the strong to share the burdens of the weak.

Think more about duties and less about rights. If men understand and do their duty, rights will follow, and problems will be solved.

Confront all men with the message of Jesus Christ, which alone satisfies the deeper human needs.

These basic principles and objectives expressed in the statement by the United Lutheran Church are a blueprint not only for Christian conduct and living but the only effective answer to our domestic problems and to the challenge of crass materialism and Communist tyranny.

Every well-informed working man and woman can sincerely subscribe to those high ideals and noble objectives.

Enlightened representatives of management also accept them, not only in the interest of good labor-management relations, but as a matter of intelligent self-interest and a recognition of the common interests we all share in a prosperous economy, a nation morally, spiritually and economically strong and united.

I have always believed that a labor union must be much more than an economic weapon to gain advantage for its members, important as this may be. It must be a force for social and economic justice, not only for union members, but for all working people and for all citizens. It must be an influence for community betterment and for promoting the public welfare.

Labor union members, like other folks, are generally good citizens. As a group, they have the same good qualities and the same human weaknesses that are found in all other groups in our society. This is equally true in management.

There are wide differences in labor and management views and interests. But in each group, most individuals are dedicated, sincere, and honorable men and women. On each side it is but a small minority who betray the thrust and confidence of their associates for illicit personal gain.

A major obstacle to good labor-management relations is the lack of trust and confidence in each other and the failure to apply commonsense principles and the Christian approach to our problems.

Neither labor nor management has a monopoly on virtue or sin.

But the very nature of labor unions has made them an effective force for the advancement and enactment of programs like social security, unemployment insurance, housing, education, workmen's compensation, and many laws that have contributed to the security and well-being of all workers, union and nonunion, and of all American citizens.

It is labor's political efforts for such legislation which offends conservative manage-

ment groups which have historically opposed social reform programs sponsored by labor organizations.

It is quite evident that organized workers played a major role in every important economic reform and social advance made during the past century.

It must also be said that among the leaders in great forward movements in the United States were men of great wealth. Thomas Jefferson is a shining example.

Today, as in the past, the application of Christian principles of brotherhood, social justice, and good will, is the answer to pressing human problems and the dangers that confront us.

We must intelligently and justly solve these difficult domestic and internal problems if we are to successfully meet the challenge of communism and the threat to human freedom around the world.

Only by national unity and by examples of social justice can we show the world that democracy, with its recognition of moral, spiritual and human values offers hope for future peace and progress.

It has been our lot to live in a time of great social upheaval. The world has been made smaller by progress made in the fields of communication and transportation. Exploding populations have added to the world problems. In many parts of the earth people live in poverty and without hope. Tonight more than a third of the world's children will go to bed hungry.

Feeding on hopeless and impoverished people, communism continues to grow. The whole world fears the threat of Communist slavery and the catastrophe of nuclear war.

The world crisis dwarfs our domestic problems. Yet we cannot intelligently disassociate domestic policies from foreign affairs. What we do in our own country, whether good or bad, affects our prestige and influence in other lands, and is a factor in the cold war between the free world and Communist tyranny.

On this Labor Sunday, let us all rededicate ourselves to the application of Christian principles of social justice, good will, mutual understanding and higher ethical, spiritual and moral standards.

There is no other answer to solve our problems at home if we are to keep our country strong and free.

There is no other answer if we are to keep the world free from Communist dictatorship and totalitarian slavery. There is no other answer to the threat of atomic and nuclear war which even for the victors would mean mass suicide and desolation.

Yet the application of Christian principles for the solution of our social and economic ills is not an easy task. You will hear powerful voices opposing necessary action to end the waste of unemployment and the waste in human and natural resources.

You may be tagged as a do-gooder, as if there were something wrong in doing good. Even your loyalty may be questioned. The road ahead is not an easy one.

Widespread confusion grows with false fears that our country cannot afford to do what is essential for its own strength and survival. We drift on with unfilled human and public needs while great machines and millions of men stand idle.

Yet we need not be without hope and faith in the future. In the world crisis time and history are on our side, on the side of right and freedom. No tyranny can long survive, for the spark of human freedom burns deep in human breasts. It can never be extinguished. However low it may sometimes burn, it will again burst into a flame.

With you, I subscribe to the principles pronounced by the United Lutheran Church as a solution of labor management problems and our Nation's social and economic ills.

Let us together again dedicate ourselves to these objectives as a service to our fellow man, to our country, and to God.

Private Timber Empire Open to Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, long before there was any talk about the Federal Government's taking huge hunks of land to set aside as recreational areas for an out-of-doors-conscious public, private timberland holders in the State of Maine put out the welcome mat to citizens seeking fun in a natural setting. And so it still is today, with the privately held timberlands of Maine being made available to all who care to use and not abuse them.

This multiple-use concept is one that has been used with a high degree of success by the U.S. Forestry Service in the administration of our national forests, a multidimensional approach which utilizes all the resources of a natural area toward the end of maximum benefits.

An article appearing in the September 12 issue of the Bangor Daily News treats appropriately of this unselfish conduct on the part of Maine's private timberland holders, pointing up how the "no trespassing" sign has been something that has been long passing in the privately held timberlands of Maine:

[From the Bangor Daily News, Sept. 12, 1961]

PRIVATE TIMBER EMPIRE OPEN TO PUBLIC

(By Earle Doucette)

During the vacation season that is coming to an end tens of thousands of persons wandered at will throughout Maine's magnificent forest areas, the greatest east of the Rockies. They traveled by car, by plane, by outboard motor, and by canoe, enjoying the myriad lakes, streams, rivers, mountains, and woodland trails. Among them were campers, hikers, canoeists, and fishermen, and if there was even one of them who didn't have the time of his life in these wondrous regions we haven't heard about him.

Those of us who are Maine folk take in stride this privilege of wandering in the woods wherever our fancy leads us. We are used to going where we wish, because with minor exceptions we have always had the run of the forests. To our visitors, however, it is a never-ending miracle that this is so, because they know that our forests are privately owned, and but for the forbearance of the owners we could be barred from them.

There are solid reasons why free access to our forests must be a matter of concern not only to the owners, but to all of us. They are our bread and butter, our greatest resource by far. Our giant pulp-paper mills, and our hundreds of wood-turning factories and other wood-using industries are our largest employers. Our power companies, that also employ many hundreds, depend upon the forests to retain the rainfall, doling it out through the year, thus eliminating the danger of freshets on one hand, and dangerously low water levels on the other. Realizing all this, our fear of the carelessly started fire that could destroy in a twinkling what nature has created in half a century, or more, is real, and ever present. And if anyone thinks that this fear is overexaggerated he has failed to read the papers recently. Awesome forest fires that have swept through Newfoundland killed at least

for the balance of this century that Province's hope of expanding its pulp-paper industry.

But though they are thoroughly aware of the ever-present danger of fire, those who own the forests, or operate therein, continue not only to allow us to visit them as we wish, but actually encourage us to do so. There are no public roads that penetrate deep into the forest regions, but we are welcome to use the excellent private roads that are used for the hauling out of the wood, and for other purposes. We are also welcome to use other facilities and conveniences, in fact some have been constructed solely for our use. The threat of fire has been met as best it can by asking us to please be careful, and by the acquisition at considerable expense of the latest and best firefighting equipment.

What is most significant in all this, we think, is that it is an object lesson in how our system of free enterprise can work for the good of all. We have put into practice the theory of multiple-use of forest lands. They are ever producing so that they will forever yield us employment, and they are also a permanent playground for all of us, free of cost.

If there is anywhere in the world where this multiple-use principle is more successfully employed we are unaware of it. You might think that in the so-called, but misnamed, "people's" governments the worker would be allowed to use the forests freely, because in theory they are his very own, but he isn't. That privilege is retained for party leaders.

Recently a group of nationally known outdoor writers was in Maine studying the multiple-use of our forest lands. What they will write about it will undoubtedly influence an accelerated growth of the idea in other States. If so, we can chalk up another first for Maine, one that has grown because of the wisdom and generosity of forest landowners and operators on the one hand, and the gratitude and cooperativeness of those of us who like the outdoors on the other.

Tribute to the Late Gilbert Forbes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the text of a tribute to the late Gilbert Forbes, veteran Indiana newscaster, which I have recorded for radio station WFBM and television station WFBM-TV in Indianapolis, with which he was associated.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GILBERT FORBES

I personally, and all of those in Indiana who have listened to him on radio and watched him on television, have lost a treasured friend in the death of Mr. Gilbert Forbes, one of Indiana's pioneer newscasters.

Gil Forbes died in Indianapolis Monday night after a year of lingering illness.

Mr. Forbes, a native of St. Louis, had been an adopted Hoosier since he first came to radio station WFBM in Indianapolis in 1937. His newscasts became a habit with those of us who maintained a deep interest in local, national, and international affairs.

Some have called Gilbert Forbes a commentator. To me, he was a radio reporter of the highest type because he held always to his inviolable rule of objectivity in the presentation of the news.

In the early days of telecasting in Indiana, Mr. Forbes became the first new voice in that vast new media of news dissemination. He remained active in the field until his last illness. Few people knew that he was also an accomplished musician.

While Gilbert Forbes as a voice has been stilled, his memory as a fine newscaster, a leader in civic affairs and a fine gentleman will remain with those who knew him personally and over the airwaves.

Conferences Between American and Argentine Industrialists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, people-to-people efforts can take many forms. The Peace Corps and individual groups like CARE are helping representatives of our Nation to understand the hopes and problems of people in less developed nations.

Many businessmen, I am sure, have wondered how they can participate in other efforts to help achieve understanding among free peoples. How can their talents be used?

Recently a New Jersey businessman joined other men who shared their executive know-how with fellow company directors in Argentina. The precedent-setting mission was planned by our State Department. Mr. Fred D. Herbert, Jr. of Upper Montclair, N.J., said he had never worked harder in his life, and he added: "It was one of the most inspiring experiences of my business career."

Mr. President, the lessons of this recent seminar in Argentina should receive wide discussion among the business community. I believe that the State Department will welcome suggestions and comments on similar missions. A recent Newark Sunday News article describes the visit in some detail. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE AID FOR ARGENTINA—NEW JERSEY
MAN SHARED MANAGEMENT KNOW-HOW AT PARLEY

WEST PATERSON.—"I'm no different from most Americans—I'm against communism, but I had no opportunity to do anything to fight it, personally. This was just such an opportunity."

That was how Fred D. Herbert, Jr., president of the Kearfott Division of General Precision, Inc., explained his speedy acceptance of a State Department invitation to take part in a precedent-setting mission to Argentina last month.

Herbert, who lives at 35 Glenwood Road, Upper Montclair, was one of three presidents of medium-sized American companies sent to Argentina for a weeklong conference with

15 presidents and directors of Argentinian companies. Their assignment was to explain successful American business practices and techniques on the top level, and give ideas to the Argentinian presidents for improving their own practices and increasing production.

"Communism is a real threat in Argentina," he said, "and the company heads that I met are well aware of it. The reason for the trip was to help these Argentinian industrialists get their companies on their feet, convince them to act to improve the living conditions of their employees and the population in general, and in that way fight communism."

CONFERENCE MEMBERS

Taking part in the conference were Herbert, 53, whose father founded Kearfott; H. Thomas Hallowell, Jr., president of the Standard Pressed Steel Co. of Jenkintown, Pa., and Harold Scherr, president of the Juvenile Manufacturing Co. of San Antonio, Tex. Moderator and organizer of the trip was Edward D. DeLuca, Pittsburgh management consultant.

The Conference was held from June 19 to 23 in Mar Del Plata, resort city outside Buenos Aires, arranged by the Council for International Progress in Management under sponsorship of the State Department's International Cooperation Administration and Argentina's leading management association.

"I was afraid it might be a boondoggle, a waste of time, a junket," he said. "It turned out to be anything but that. I never worked harder in my life. I did homework every night, and so did all the 15 Argentinians."

The 5-day seminar, Herbert said, "one of the most inspiring experiences of my business career," was a full round of uninterrupted formal and informal discussions. An important part, he said, was centered upon the relationship between management and employees.

WIDE GULF

"Traditionally, here has been a wide gulf between Argentine company management and the worker," Herbert said. "Our neighbors to the south have not enjoyed the close relationships and mutual benefits which result when good communications exist within an organization. I feel that our discussions on this subject were enthusiastically received by the Argentinians, and will help them to understand why our country as a whole has benefited from the private enterprise system."

Herbert said that during his talks he explained his awareness that American and Argentine business heads face different problems. However, he emphasized the need to "sell" the companies—"facilities, products and importance to their well-being"—to all employees through better communications, supervision, and employee training.

Other points he stressed, Herbert said, included:

The importance of making foremen a part of management. He said presently the post of foreman is the highest a worker can attain in Argentina.

The desirability of higher wages and more liberal fringe benefits. He said these fringe benefits, so much a part of the American business scene, are all but nonexistent in Argentina.

Determining what employees really want, through questionnaires and surveys.

PROGRAM IN SAFETY

Improved safety devices in plants and publicize these achievements.

A vigorous public relations program to tell the people of the country of the accomplishments of industry and the capitalistic system and its importance in their future welfare.

Greater delegation of authority by top management.

Discontinuance of the practice of staying aloof from government. Express views personally and through their industry and management groups directly to their government representatives.

Strong support for universities, financially and otherwise, to increase the supply of engineering and business-oriented graduates and drive out the strong communistic cells and influences now felt there.

Herbert said he found the Argentine executives very receptive to the recommendations of the American business heads. "They are aware that they have the responsibility of doing something to arrest the spread of communism," Herbert declared. "I did get the feeling of urgency from them. They know it will be their heads if Argentina goes Communist."

FILM IMPRESSES

Herbert said he found time to visit only one plant in Argentina, but explained he learned quickly that there is very little internal communication in companies there. "There are few company publications or training programs," he said. "We stressed the need for these."

He said a movie depicting Kearfott operations so impressed the Argentinians that they asked him to leave the film for additional showings.

The idea of delegating much authority, Herbert said, also had a strong impact. "It isn't done very much there," he said. "They (company heads) work like mad, signing papers and checks and doing so many other chores that they don't have the time to think of things like employee relations."

Herbert emphasized the American company heads were careful not to "talk down" to the Argentinians. "They have pride," he said. "They don't want U.S. money. They want aid, through technical training and programs like that."

Herbert said he would welcome an opportunity to return to Argentina, or take part in similar seminars in other countries. "This is the most effective way a businessman can help in the war against communism," he said. "I never spent a more fruitful, effective week of hard work in my life."

Red Setback in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include therein the following editorial from Foster's Daily Democrat, published in Dover, N.H., Monday, September 18, 1961, entitled "Red Setback in Japan."

RED SETBACK IN JAPAN

Nikita Khrushchev's efforts to loosen United States-Japanese ties have been a resounding flop. The Soviet boes has been told by Prime Minister Hayato Ikeda that his country will not be weaned away from its alliance with this country and its links with the free world.

Ikeda, who recently returned from a trip to the United States in which he was warmly received by President Kennedy, implied that the Japanese resented Russia's meddling in their affairs. He informed Khrushchev that if he wants a peace treaty with Japan all he has to do is return the Soviet-held South Kurile Islands.

Khrushchev can thank not only himself for this rebuff but his first Deputy Premier, Anastas Mikoyan, whose recent visit to Japan was a bungling display of indiscretion and lack of diplomacy. In his attacks on the United States, Mikoyan grossly overestimated anti-American feeling in Japan. His bluster failed to awe or impress Japanese businessmen and officials.

This instance of Soviet fumbling should be reassuring. Too many people have the notion that the Russians are Machiavellian connivers who never make mistakes.

Goals of the New Frontier—Action for Prosperity, for People, for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, when John F. Kennedy became President on January 20, 1961, he faced a wide range of urgent problems which had been swept under the rug by the previous administration:

A deepening recession: The third serious economic slowdown in 6 years. In January 1961, 5.4 million American workers were out of jobs; business failures were at the highest levels since the depression of the 1930's; housing starts were at the lowest levels since 1949; we were using only about half our steel capacity; dozens of American communities had been suffering major unemployment continuously for years; our gold supply was rapidly disappearing abroad; farm incomes were critically low; our overall national economic growth was too slow to meet our needs.

Neglected public needs: We had been falling behind in meeting the needs of our rapidly growing population for schools, roads, housing, parks, power, public facilities of all kinds.

Neglected human needs: While, happily, most Americans were living well, millions of older people, the unemployed and their families, people in depressed areas—were often getting barely enough to live on.

A deteriorating defense: While the United States still had the most powerful Armed Forces in the world, our position had been slipping in terms of relative strength compared to that of our principal opponents, especially in the critical areas of ballistic missiles and capacity for limited war.

A powder keg world: All over the world we faced explosive situations which had been neglected or patched over until all of the choices still left open to the United States were almost equally undesirable. The Congo, Cuba, Laos, Berlin, headed the parade of inherited crises. Our relations with our allies were shaky in many cases. We had only begun to face up to the challenge of the dozens of new and economically underdeveloped nations. Soviet and Chinese communism were becoming increasingly bold and aggressive.

Here is the story of some of the specific things that have been done in the first months in office of the new administration to meet these problems.

ACTION FOR PROSPERITY

President Kennedy moved swiftly to halt the recession and help meet the long-term economic problems of the United States by:

Putting more money in circulation to make more jobs: Tax refunds and VA life insurance dividends were speeded up; defense and other Government contracts were accelerated; housing interest rates were lowered; legislation to extend unemployment compensation benefits was proposed by the President and passed by Congress.

Improving farm incomes: Price support levels for many crops were raised by administrative action; an emergency feed grain program was drafted by President Kennedy and passed by Congress and farmer participation is exceeding all expectations.

Helping depressed areas: A rounded program to help depressed urban and rural areas attract new industry, provide needed public facilities and retrain workers was proposed by the President and passed by Congress.

Aid to business: Special aids to small businesses have been stepped up; an overall tax revision plan to encourage business modernization has been proposed and is under consideration in Congress.

Stopping the gold outflow: A vigorous program to restore confidence in the dollar and increase U.S. export earnings was launched.

RESULTS

The recession was licked. While unemployment is still serious, all economic authorities agree that the U.S. economy is heading upward toward new levels of overall prosperity.

Business is better. Housing starts were up sharply; business failures down; steel production and many other business indicators up.

Farm incomes are up. Total farm income was running at a rate \$1 billion a year higher in 1961 than in 1960.

The gold outflow has been stopped. As early as March the U.S. supply of gold actually increased after 18 months of steady decreases.

ACTION FOR PEOPLE

To help meet neglected human and public needs, President Kennedy launched a wide range of new and expanded Government programs. Among other important measures, he acted to:

Feed the hungry: On his very first day in office, President Kennedy issued an Executive order making more and better surplus foods available to more needy families throughout the Nation.

Improve social security benefits: The President proposed and Congress has passed legislation increasing minimum social security benefits; reducing the optional retirement age for men to 62; and broadening coverage. Over 3 million of the neediest people in America, including many needy children, will benefit from these changes.

Increase and expand minimum wages: The President has proposed and Congress has approved an increase of minimum wages from \$1 to \$1.25 an hour and extension of minimum wage protection to millions of additional workers—the first major extension of coverage since this law was passed in the 1930's.

Help provide better homes in more livable communities: A \$4.9 billion 4-year overall housing and urban redevelopment bill was proposed by the President and passed by the Congress. It provides much-needed help for low and medium income housing; aid for urban planning and redevelopment; improved urban transportation; new help to communities to secure parks and other open spaces.

Broaden civil rights: President Kennedy has put the great power and resources of the Presidency and the executive branch of the Government into the long struggle to achieve full and equal rights for all Americans—in voting, in jobs, in education, and other spheres of national life. In a recent poll of Negro leaders, an amazing 81 percent responded favorably to a question on whether they felt the new administration had "lived up to campaign promises" in this field.

ACTION FOR PEACE

In the complex and vital interrelated areas of national defense and international relations, President Kennedy took the following constructive steps, among many others, in his first months in office:

Strengthening our defenses: The President acted swiftly to step up our missile capacity as part of our nuclear deterrent. For example, our Polaris submarine program has been accelerated so that there will now be a full fleet in commission 3 years sooner than under previous plans. At the same time special steps have been taken to improve and increase our capacity for resisting aggression in brushfire and guerrilla-type warfare. Immediate troop carrier plane procurement has been stepped up by 150 percent and training of special forces in guerrilla tactics has been substantially increased. New plans have been set forth by the President to build up U.S. and Allied strength to meet any contingency in connection with the Berlin crisis.

Strengthening the free world: We have cemented relationships with our traditional allies by strengthening NATO; joining the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and engaging in continuous consultation with Britain, France, West Germany, Canada, and other leading allied nations at all levels, including personal visits by President Kennedy. We have opened new doors in our relationships with the dozens of new and less developed nations in the free world by launching a new kind of foreign aid program, stressing political and social reform as well as economic and military strength; setting up the Peace Corps to enable Americans to help these countries on a firsthand basis; identifying ourselves with the ambitions of colonial peoples for independence;

mounting an expanded food for peace program, and many other measures.

Being firm but not belligerent in our relations with the Communist bloc: President Kennedy has made it perfectly clear to Premier Khrushchev that the United States will not yield on the freedom of West Berlin and its people, come what may. In facing Communist efforts at penetration in other areas—from Cuba to Laos to the Congo—we have sought to stiffen free world resistance by all means short of direct U.S. military intervention. Some of these situations had deteriorated so far that we have not been able to achieve our objectives. In others we have been more successful. As President Kennedy has emphasized to the American people, this is a long-term many-sided struggle in which there are no quick and easy solutions.

AMERICA IS ON THE MOVE AGAIN

Behind and beyond the many specific achievements that have been mentioned in this pamphlet—and many others of which space has prevented any mention—lies a basic new spirit and new approach which is the real essence of the new Kennedy administration.

This new spirit is one of vigor, of courage, of imagination, and of realism. It is the spirit of a young America with young leadership, facing up to its problems with a clear eye and a strong and steady hand.

This new approach is one of action. As President Kennedy himself said over and over during the 1960 campaign: "This country must move again." And as the New York Times summed it up: "The President is not content to say 'something ought to be done'—he does something."

President Kennedy has appealed to all Americans to participate in the challenges of the New Frontier—to work and sacrifice as may be necessary to achieve the great goals of our Nation at home and abroad. And Americans have responded enthusiastically to his call.

President Kennedy has said "Let us begin," and we have indeed begun. This country is indeed "on the move again."

If Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the editorial writer for the Newark (N.J.) Evening News on September 19 made a very concise and clear statement of the problem of Federal spending and I submit it to my colleagues for their earnest consideration:

IF NECESSARY

Few could have been surprised by Treasury Secretary Dillon's weekend assertion that with increased military expenditures, tax reduction next year is improbable. The mounting deficit and the Berlin crisis long ago made that pretty obvious.

Nor, on the other hand, will many accept too confidently Mr. Dillon's assurance that a tax increase will not be necessary if defense spending does not exceed expectations. Besides defense, there are all sorts of programs in the works that will push up Federal costs.

In the crisis that confronts the Nation most Americans probably would cheerfully pay still higher taxes if necessary to assure adequate national defense and enable us to deal with our enemies from a position of strength. But this willingness needs assurance that the sacrifices Mr. Kennedy has called for will be shared by all, and that waste and nonessential spending be pruned rigorously.

Wiley Looks to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in planning and working toward an ever-better future, my home State of Wisconsin is making a most commendable effort to mobilize its human and natural resources to better serve its people and the Nation.

This is being done by effective action to meet the needs of the people now as well as projecting plans for the distant future.

Recently, Mr. David Carley, head of the State department of resource development, offered some guidelines to—and predictions on—developments in the years ahead. Reflecting upon possible trends of progress not only in Wisconsin but throughout the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE FOR WISCONSIN ECONOMIC RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT IS GIVEN BY CHIEF OF STATE DEPARTMENT

(By David Carley)

MADISON.—In the development of Wisconsin's human and natural resources some advance picture of the next two or three decades is necessary to give dimension and offer guidelines to the critical job of the wise use and development of our assets.

What trends in our governmental, social, and economic institutions now seem apparent? I think the following are some of the things we will see by 1985.

1. Wisconsin population very close to 5½ million people. The present trend toward concentration of population in urban areas will continue with metropolitan areas stretching out to engulf still more farmland and smaller communities. Suburban growth will be even more accelerated than at present; in part, it will be at the expense of the central city.

2. New forms of governmental systems at the local level—systems that will be developed with the problems caused by great masses of people living in urban communities stretched out over great areas.

3. A revival of urban mass transportation systems to accommodate increased population growth and to provide better city traffic control.

4. Electric automobiles, as a health measure to stop air pollution as well as to save

petroleum resources. These cars will be lighter, more durable, simpler and cheaper to own and operate. On the highway these cars will be controlled electronically, moving from city to city at speeds up to 150 miles per hour and on highways with capacities 100 times greater than at present.

5. Much more rigorous controls by the State and local governments over use of natural resources. Water use in particular will be one of the most important concerns of State government.

6. Local and State governments will increase control on land use—zoning power will be extended to include design of building as well; also the rate and time of new building to be guided by local authorities.

7. The great problem of Wisconsin finance, that of adequate revenues for municipalities, to be settled in favor of local units with the right given to them to raise funds independent of State government.

8. Annual State budgets and annual sessions of the legislature; State government agencies to be greatly decentralized geographically in an attempt to stay "close to the people."

9. Regional transportation centers, particularly airports. Commercial aviation terminals to become less in number but with fast transportation to those centers from areas 40 to 50 miles away.

10. At least two more major universities in the State—and both secondary and higher education in Wisconsin on a year-around schedule.

11. Year-around activity at all Wisconsin ports on the Great Lakes. Ice-blocked harbors a thing of the past with the installation of already-designed "bubblers" which keep harbor water in constant movement.

12. Development of independent household methods of waste disposal; through use of deep nuclear power or other methods, devices for quickly disposing of sewage, waste paper, garbage, and trash; great savings in sewer and sewage disposal plant construction costs and trash and garbage pickup, but most importantly the elimination of the largest source of water pollution.

13. A greatly accelerated program of private investment in recreation facilities in Wisconsin as recreation time and opportunities increase. This means private development of hunting and fishing areas near metropolitan centers, de luxe camping areas, ski and snow developments, and day-use recreation areas for picnicking, hiking, fishing, etc., near urban centers.

Announcing an Addition to the Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[H.R. 8, 87th Cong., 1st sess.]

In the House of Representatives, September 5, 1961. Mr. and Mrs. David S. King (Utah) introduced the following resolution which was referred to the Committee on Internal Affairs:

House resolution announcing an addition to the family to perpetuate the reign of Kings.

Whereas on the 5th day of September 1961, Rosalie King brought forth a 7-pound 5-ounce boy; and

Whereas said child measured 20½ inches from the top of the head to the sole of his foot; and

Whereas said child has a swatch of blond hair atop his crown: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the child shall be known as Christopher Henry King, the eighth child of this family.

(This was printed at the expense of the boy's father.)

FCC's Proposals To Shift VHF Television Station to UHF Channels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a companion bill to H.R. 9267, which was introduced by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] on September 16. I wish to endorse the remarks that he has previously made in the RECORD concerning this matter, for I, too, am seriously concerned by the FCC's proposals to shift VHF television stations to UHF channels.

One shift of a VHF station to UHF already proposed by the FCC affects WREX-TV, which now operates on channel 13 in my hometown of Rockford. I understand that if WREX-TV is forced to shift from channel 13 to UHF it would not be able to serve about 6,000 square miles of the area it now serves. If this shift to UHF is ordered, about half of my district would no longer be able to receive television on channel 13. Especially important is the fact that a large number of the people in my district who would lose their channel 13 service would be left without any television at all if channel 13 is taken out of Rockford. Those who would still get television from some station would not have the choice of programs they now have. It would not be in the public interest to take television away from these people, and I must oppose as vigorously as I can any proposal to do so.

The FCC's plan to shift VHF stations to UHF is going to hurt the rural dwellers, the farmers, and the people in the smaller towns in my district most of all. Yet these folks have a greater dependence on and need for television than any of our citizens. The outlying areas simply do not have available the other facilities for entertainment, information and education that are found in larger communities. Thus, the FCC's proposals would take television away from those who need it the most.

The people in my district know from experience what will happen if channel 13 is lost. We already have a UHF station in Rockford which operates on channel 39. A very substantial part of my district which can get channel 13 cannot get channel 39 at all. Other large parts of my district which can get some channel 39 service do not get as good service from channel 39 as from channel 13. This is not to say that the channel 39 service is not wanted or is not useful. We are glad we have it and

we hope we keep it. The point is we need to keep channel 13 to operate right along with channel 39. It seems to me the most reasonable way to bring this about is to solve the receiver problem and to give no further consideration to "deintermixture."

I believe it to be my duty to do everything I can to protect the people in my district against the loss of their channel 13 television service. The FCC has indicated that it intends to take their channel 13 service away from them. If this is the case, we in the Congress must step in to make sure that such a tragedy does not occur.

In this regard I want to emphasize an important point that cannot be overemphasized. The FCC's UHF proposals are not limited to just a few places. They affect the whole country. In addition to the eight cases already started, of which Rockford is one, the FCC has said it contemplates other cases later on and that, indeed, it is looking toward an eventual move of all, or almost all, television from VHF to UHF. Therefore, the FCC's proposals pose a serious threat to the people throughout the country and are of serious concern to every Member of this House.

Highway Safety Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared, at my request, by Mr. Duane Carter, of Speedway, Ind., whom many of you will recognize as one of the leading veteran race car drivers in the United States.

I do so because Mr. Carter and another Hoosier, Gene Hartley, are now engaging in one of the most effective highway safety programs in the country in these days when the demands for effective safety programs are at a premium.

The program was presented last year in more than 30 Indiana high schools as part of a nationwide effort to reduce the terrible traffic toll. U.S. military services have recognized its value and have sought and received the cooperation of the Champion Spark Plug Co., sponsor of the programs, in presentations hoped to improve the highway safety records of the thousands upon thousands of military vehicles.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMPION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAM

In a serious effort to combat the mounting death toll upon our Nations' streets and highways, J. R. "Dick" McGeorge, public relations director of the Champion Spark Plug Co. caused to be initiated in 1955 a highway safety program, aimed at the teenage or beginner driver. This is an educational program put on in the Nations high schools at

their general assemblies. The idea being to make these new drivers safety conscious in the initial stages of their driving careers. The Air Force requested this program in 1957 for their personnel, and today it has now been utilized by all branches of the service, both at home and overseas.

It has been recognized by educators, law enforcement officers, civic leaders and the military as a most timely and worthwhile public service program. The National Safety Council has awarded the Champion Spark Plug Co. its public service award. Editorial praise from many newspapers and publications has also been recorded.

The Champion Spark Plug Co. utilizes the services of the Nation's leading automobile racing drivers to present this unique safety program, namely the veteran drivers who have competed in the famous Hoosier classic and who have completed the full 500-mile Memorial Day race at Indianapolis with an average speed in excess of 100 miles per hour without relief.

Hoosiers Gene Hartley and Duane Carter are members of the eight-man driver-lecture highway safety team sponsored by Champion, now currently touring the country putting the program on for the military, high schools, service clubs, and civic organizations of the United States.

U.S. Self-Interest May Demand Our Withdrawal From United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the events of the next few days may well determine the course of mankind. The untimely death of Dag Hammarskjöld and the announced Soviet intention to insist upon their plan for operation of the United Nations makes it imperative that we take a second look at our participation in that organization. We are badly outvoted in the U.N. by a combination of outright Communist nations and the so-called unaligned countries which have shown great partiality to the Soviet ideas. It may well be that the time has come for us to leave the United Nations. Certainly, if it is to become merely a propaganda forum, for which we pay the whole bill, for the spread of Communist doctrines, or if it is to be used to make ineffective any move against Communist aggression, then, by all means, we should make it clear that we will have no part of it.

But what is happening? The administration is already committing us to turning even more of our sovereignty over to the U.N. The following news story in the Wall Street Journal of September 19 and an editorial from the same paper, indicate the lengths to which the administration is going even before we know under whose control the United Nations will function. Mr. Speaker, I say the American people are concerned about this headlong rush to further weaken our position in the world and we had better make clear our position that we can and will withdraw from the United Nations if, in so doing, we are

protecting the freedom of our own people.

THE U.N.'S FUTURE—UNITED STATES SEEKS TO GIVE IT WIDER POWERS DESPITE HAMMARSKJOLD'S DEATH—KENNEDY MAY SUGGEST BERLIN DISARMAMENT ROLE; CONGO EVENTS POINT UP RISK—THE PROBLEM OF SUCCESSION

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—The African plane-crash death of Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld is adding a new note of agonizing uncertainty to a bold U.S. gamble to expand the peacemaking powers of the United Nations.

The gamble was big even before Mr. Hammarskjöld's death. Besides its floundering in the Congo, the U.N. has been swollen almost unmanageably by an influx of new neutral members and it has been menaced by Communist takeover efforts. But in the face of the increased uncertainty, the United States yesterday was sticking to this strategy already in the works for the U.N. General Assembly session opening in New York this week: More—not less—U.S. encouragement for the world body to plunge into major peace and security missions of the sort the current Congo-Katanga exercise started out to be.

Support for a greatly strengthened U.N. executive arm to permit more varied jobs as cold war conciliator, mediator or inspector. Assignment might range from settling minor irritants such as the Austrian-Italian hassle over Italy's Tyrol to controlling outer space. They also might include watchdog activities on frontiers punctured by guerrilla infiltration and on-the-spot probes of subversive activities in lands like South Vietnam.

Redoubled U.S. backing and participation in U.N. activities all along the line, including some specific U.S. proposals for a big United Nations role in the Berlin and disarmament issues, and for further boosts in economic development activities under U.N. auspices.

THE QUESTION OF A SUCCESSOR

So heavy are the uncertainties now overhanging the world body that the whole tenor of this approach could alter drastically in a matter of days or in months ahead. The major question now, of course, is Mr. Hammarskjöld's successor. In the proud, tireless Swede, the United States had perhaps the U.N.'s most ardent advocate of a powerful, active executive for the world group; his just-published report to this week's Assembly hammers that point. If his efforts at even-handedness miffed some Westerners, they drew forth Nikita Khrushchev's wild rage.

Yesterday few of the stunned delegates on hand were betting on a successor. Tunisia's diminutive foreign minister, Mongi Slim, an old U.N. hand and key figure in Congo policy-making, was one name cropping up. But guessing centered on still more "neutralist" figures from the growing and pivotal Afro-Asian bloc. With nominations subject to Security Council veto, a long deadlock may ensue. And Russia may seize upon this opportunity to push again for a three-headed secretary-generalship, based on the so-called troika principle, and made up of a Communist, a Westerner and a neutral, each armed with a veto. The effect, U.S. authorities figure, would be total paralysis.

Such paralysis could set in quickly if the Russians stand fast on their troika demand and veto all candidates to succeed Mr. Hammarskjöld. As far as Western officials can see, there's no existing machinery for automatic succession or for picking an acting U.N. executive, though lower-level secretariat officials can continue to run their own departments. A permanent Secretary General is elected by the General Assembly after a recommendation—in effect, a nomination—by the Security Council. To be nominated, a candidate needs seven votes from among the 11 Security Council members; however, the 5 permanent members, including Rus-

sia, have veto power and could block any prospect not to their liking. "We're in a jam," says one U.N. man, "if the Russians want to be tough."

But the United States is counting on pressures from small nations that form the bulk of U.N. membership to prevent its wallowing in disarray. It's reasoned little lands have a vital self-interest in keeping the organization working. With small-nation backing, U.S. officials hope at least they can arrange some makeshift leadership that would last for months if necessary.

Even if a successor to Mr. Hammarskjöld suitable to the United States can be elected, the Katanga chaos adds yet another major question mark; collapse of the U.N. effort there would hand the organization a damaging black eye. Meantime, before the 16th Assembly winds up, some 3 months hence or longer, the United States could suffer some stunning reverses on Red Chinese membership, on a related dispute over admitting Communist Outer Mongolia, on disarmament, or on any of a host of other issues.

STICKING TO STRATEGY

With the crisis in Katanga already fanning congressional criticism of the U.N. and with some key European allies looking increasingly askance at the world group, the threat of still further setbacks for this country's U.N. policy would seem to argue loudly for a highly cautious approach for now. Yet chats with key officials yesterday revealed no disposition to alter the basic strategy already agreed upon: That the best defense of this country's interest in the turbulent world group is a powerful offensive to make the U.N. more effective and a good deal more active.

In fact, Mr. Hammarskjöld's death figured heavily in President Kennedy's decision yesterday to address the General Assembly early in its new session. At the least, he will stoutly reaffirm U.S. support for the U.N. If influential policy makers prevail, his address will crackle with headline-catching new U.S. proposals for U.N. initiatives.

Among them:

1. A disarmament proposal, still secret but billed as far reaching, that would bid for neutral support by giving so-called unaligned nations a role in inspecting any general disarmament schemes East and West may be able to work out. While the United States will avoid trying to match Russia's sweeping, propaganda-oriented plans for general and complete disarmament, it will embrace the principle, with heavy emphasis on inspection techniques, officials say.

2. A plan to give the United Nations broad police powers in outer space in an effort to remove the heavens from cold-war conflict—from any use as a base, for example, for missile-launching platforms. Extra-terrestrial bodies as well as the great open spaces would be added to the U.N. beat. "The idea would be to apply the Antarctica approach to space, with nobody claiming sovereignty over the moon or whatever planets may be reached in coming years," says one administration planner.

INTERVENTION AND INSPECTION

3. A batch of peace and security proposals to enlarge the United Nations capacity to intervene in Congo-style crises or wherever local governments are threatened by subversion or revolution sponsored from outside their borders, i.e., from Moscow, or Peking. U.S. officials contend there are anywhere from a dozen to 20 possible variations for carrying out these proposals, including such existing United Nations machinery, rusty with disuse, as a conciliation panel for refereeing disputes. Officials talk excitedly of rapporteurs or inspection commissions that would simply keep an eye on things and issue regular reports, as is now done by U.N. officials in Jordan and along Arab-Israeli truce lines.

"Think of the impact," exclaims one authority, "if every time the Reds assassinated an anti-Communist figure in South Vietnam there was a big uproar about it in New York."

4. Increased American financial backing for a host of U.N. economic aid activities, including a Special Fund, under the direction of veteran U.S. foreign-aid, Paul Hoffman, which engages in what he terms "pre-investment investment" to determine what resources a young nation may have that are worth aiding. There also would be more U.S. technical aid to teach new lands how to plan long-term development programs, as well as to spread industrial and agricultural know-how. With its heavy accent to self-help by recipients of U.S. aid, the Kennedy administration looks warmly upon these and other U.N. activities.

THE MATTER OF BERLIN

One topic Mr. Kennedy is likely to touch on only glancingly, if at all, is Berlin. But this is no more than a reflection of the touchy state of that crisis as Secretary Rusk seeks to sound out Russia's Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko this week on prospects for negotiating a settlement. In the back of the mind of Mr. Kennedy's Berlin planners is a significant role for the United Nations both before, and perhaps as a part of, any Berlin deal.

If the crisis erupts into shooting incidents threatening wider war, or even if negotiations simply break down, the United States might welcome a United Nations airing of the issues in order to pressure the Russians. A talking point that U.S. authorities think might be telling with the Afro-Asians in New York: The West's main aim in all the Berlin haggling is simply self-determination for the Germans.

But the U.N. might also figure in a Berlin settlement. Talk grows here of assigning the U.N. to inspect Berlin access routes under any new agreement guaranteeing Western access to the city. There's interest, too, in giving the encircled city an important role as headquarters for at least some of the myriad United Nations agencies. Because U.S. officials are fearful that West Berlin, under some new arrangement with the Reds, might still be vulnerable to harassment of access routes or economic squeezes, they talk, too, of asking the United Nations to schedule more international meetings there. This would provide tourist income, for one thing. And with the world's diplomats shuttling in and out at frequent intervals, a clampdown on access might prove more embarrassing for the Reds.

Though there's been some mention of it, officials here tend to dismiss an even more ambitious scheme—that the United Nations pick up and move to West Berlin, abandoning its concrete-and-glass structure in New York. Only half-jestingly, one official notes the precedent that would be set: If the U.N. got in the habit of moving in bodily to damp down crisis spots, the cost, as well as the confusion, might become prohibitive.

REVIEW OF U.S. PROPOSALS

Yesterday, Kennedy administration planners were intensively reviewing the timing and phrasing of their U.N. proposals in the light of Mr. Hammarskjöld's death and the Congo confusion. At a late hour, there was no clear indication how much Mr. Kennedy may decide to unveil himself and how much he may leave to Secretary Rusk to unfold.

But the thinking behind the U.S. buildup for the U.N. is firmly fixed in basic Kennedy philosophy. Repeatedly, the President has sounded a call for new techniques to cope with current fashions in cold-war fighting: Undeclared guerrilla wars and subversion by the Communists. To a lot of administration strategists, the U.N.'s inspection and policing powers make it the ideal instrument for this.

A second Kennedy tenet has to do with the difficulty of great-power intervention in economic and political affairs of emerging lands. The U.S. record of failure in Laos is rated a striking case in point; but international bodies, it's reckoned, can poke deeply into a nation's internal doings without arousing anything like the same resentments. "Intervention in the name of non-intervention" is the way one U.N. partisan describes the idea.

Men like U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Harold Cleveland, and others are convinced their plans for widening U.N. peace-making authority can win strong support from smaller lands. These countries, mostly poverty stricken and powerless, see in the international group the only place they can bring their collective influence to bear, these officials maintain.

The Reds, of course, can use Security Council vetoes to block quick action by the U.N. But it's noted that the Russians went along with at least three Security Council resolutions last year authorizing the organization's Congo role, though Mr. Khrushchev subsequently went out of his way to tell Mr. Kennedy in Vienna that the Congo operations of the U.N. had worked against Red interests. Besides, officials note, Security Council vetoes can be overridden in the General Assembly.

"The Russians can't stop us if everybody else wants it," declares one U.S. diplomat at U.N. headquarters.

THE PENALTY FOR ILLUSION

The United Nations General Assembly will begin its meetings in the somber atmosphere generated by the death of Secretary General Hammarskjöld. Whatever one's disagreements with him, he worked indefatigably, by his lights and within the strictures of his office, to ease the world's chronic troubles. Not the least tribute to him is that in doing so he earned the enmity of the Soviet Union.

Yet Mr. Hammarskjöld's death, however tragic, should not obscure the deeper crisis in which the United Nations finds itself; the symptoms may well start showing up in this session. In particular it is imperative for the United States to start facing the facts about the U.N., for the U.N. is turning into a threat to U.S. interests.

The organization was founded on the gigantic illusion that the Soviets would cooperate in the construction of a peaceful world. No sensible person could believe that myth for very long, but it has bedeviled the U.N. from the beginning. Today, moreover, other illusions have piled up in the East River edifice, and they, too, are potentially dangerous.

There is, notably, what might be called the illusion of parity. According to this fantasy, every nation is the peer of every other nation; an African area with less people than a good-sized American city, and without even the minimum qualifications of nationhood, has just as much voting power as the United States.

Such an approach to world problems has no basis in fact. In the real world, a nation must earn the right to influence international affairs. It may do so by coercive development and brute force, as in the Soviet Union; or it may do so by free economic and spiritual development, as in the American tradition. But in any case, a nation should not become an arbiter of world events simply by proclaiming itself a nation.

The practical consequences of upside-down thinking about the U.N. are rapidly becoming clear. For one, the United States gets swept into—and must bear the financial burden for—enterprises of questionable merit. Is it in the U.S. interest for the U.N. to attack pro-Western Katanga, which incidentally was not about to attack the

central Congolese Government? Is it in the U.S. interest to have pro-Communists cropping up in responsible positions in the Congo?

More basically, there is the ugly situation confronting the United States in the General Assembly. For years we enjoyed an almost automatic majority in these deliberations; today, with the influx of all these newly independent nations, with their professedly neutralist stance, we are increasingly in danger of being in an almost automatic minority.

The most striking current illustration is Washington's confession that it can no longer be sure of staving off discussion of the admission of Communist China. Suppose that in due course the Assembly votes that regime in; what then does the United States do? How much good is a Security Council veto if the weight of Assembly opinion is against the United States?

Or to consider the even more immediate question of a successor to Mr. Hammarskjöld, what guarantee can there be that the new Secretary General will be tolerable to the United States, or that under his aegis we will not be pulled into still worse adventures? In its present frame of mind, the U.S. Government might not even veto the recommendation of some neutralist or worse for the post. It is not difficult to foresee many other situations where the U.N. can menace U.S. interests.

With such a prospect, the United States, in time may well be forced to consider whether it can remain in the organization. Short of that, the United States must, we believe, begin refashioning its thinking about the U.N. It must seek to use its power within the U.N. to effect its objectives, and it must steer clear of U.N. activities counter to those objectives.

The United States must finally abandon any sentimental notion of the U.N. as an inherently noble institution to which we are committed no matter what. In this connection, it wouldn't be a bad idea for the school to stop teaching our children to believe in that falsehood.

What matters is the preservation of the United States, not the United Nations. If the two are becoming irreconcilable, we had better realize it. In the real world of power politics, the penalty is heavy for building a storehouse of illusions.

Neutrals Are Set Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 18, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days President Kennedy has been host to two neutralist visitors—President Sukarno, of Indonesia, and President Keita, of Mali. President Sukarno is here as a spokesman for the Belgrade unaligned nations. He is also a champion of anticolonialism. His wish is to have the Algerians determine their own future. He further stresses that the peoples of Africa and Asia should determine their own future in the world.

Then why the double talk? President Sukarno is opposed to the same decision for Germany. What is wrong with self-determination by the Germans? The West is eager to have the people of Germany decide in a free election what their

desires are. It is the U.S.S.R. who, as always, fears these free elections.

If President Sukarno is true blue, he must favor self-determination for Germany.

We must compliment President Kennedy on his firm stand on Berlin.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I am very pleased to include in the RECORD an article by Mr. William S. White which appeared in the September 18, 1961, issue of the Buffalo Courier Express, Buffalo, N.Y. The article follows:

NEUTRALS ARE SET STRAIGHT

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—For all its great dangers, the Berlin crisis may be producing one good and wholesome byproduct.

The world's neutrals have at last been told by President Kennedy, in adequate politeness but also in adequate firmness, that the United States is fed up to the eyes with the kind of "neutralism" which is ready to denounce us on all occasions and the Soviet Union on no occasion at all.

This is the word particularly to those nations which are "neutral" in favor of the Soviet Union—Yugoslavia, Indonesia and the like.

And the message has not stopped with this. Poland, to which heavy assistance has been given in both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, has been told that its latest request is in a pigeonhole marked "indefinite." The aid request of Tito of Yugoslavia likewise is going to get indefinitely lost here. While we won't try to use aid as a club, we also won't go on extending aid without any regard to the attitude of recipients.

This chill in Washington has been caused by a number of factors, not least the recent meeting of nonaligned nations in Yugoslavia. The "nonaligned" have managed to look the other way at all Russian sin. They looked the other way at Khrushchev's breaking of the armistice on nuclear testing, which has now thrown up 10 new blasts to contaminate the air.

They looked the other way at Khrushchev's brutal closing of the escape hatches to freedom by sealing the East-West Berlin border. They wound up by solemnly dispatching neutralist leaders to get calling on Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy with what amounts to appeals to the burglar. Khrushchev, to take it a bit easier and to the victim, Kennedy, to cease his unseemly struggles in self-defense lest there be a war in which the neutralists might get hurt.

(A foreign diplomat who is far from naive told this correspondent: "Yes, people (the neutral leaders) can get that cynical; but how on earth can they do it without at least grinning?")

This correspondent, who had never been convinced of the total sanctity of the "neutrals," was among those who thought we were lucky to get off at the Yugoslav meeting as well as we did, considering who was there and that it was held on Communist territory.

For taking into account the incredible mentality of the neutralists to date, the mere fact that they did not declare outright that we and not Khrushchev were to blame for Khrushchev's barbed-wire wall in Berlin was actually a small net gain. Even this highly relative restraint exposed the fact that while they would never admit it, they were at last aware of who was really disturbing the world's peace.

The President, at all events, was by no means pleased, as he has just shown here to his neutralist visitors, President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Keita of Mali. He was nice to them, as the saying goes, but they left here knowing he has reached his sticking point. He had gone to great length

to get along with the neutrals. A most happy day has now arrived: hereafter, it is their job to get along with him, for a change.

Their bottom purpose here was to try to talk him into not doing anything to annoy Khrushchev. And his official reply, at the end, is as interesting as what was said privately in the meantime. For the first substantive sentence of that reply was its heart: "I have made it clear that the position of the West and of the West Berliners will be defended."

Then was added the long-known fact that the United States always stands ready for honorable negotiation—without appeasement—if Khrushchev really wants that kind of negotiation. At minimum the neutralists had hoped that a Presidential promise to negotiate would dominate and flavor the conference. What dominated it, instead, was a promise to fight, if fight we must.

Financing of Badly Needed Hurricane Flood Control Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today the second major hurricane of the season rampages up the Atlantic coast, bringing with its high winds and 20-foot waves a serious threat to life and property. And, while plants shut down and homes are evacuated in many areas of New York and New England, there could be no more appropriate time to urge the Federal Government to take cognizance of the severe damage that can result from the tidal flooding that accompanies such storms, and to recognize at the same time that much of it could be prevented—if a more realistic attitude is taken toward the financing of badly needed hurricane flood control projects.

The industrial city of New Bedford, in my district, which today braces itself for Hurricane Esther, suffered some \$27 million worth of damage when Hurricane Carol struck in 1954. That figure does not include wind damage, lost man-hours or lost profits—just destruction from tidal flooding. The Federal Government shared in this loss, because most of it was in the industrial area of the city, which meant shutdowns, machinery destroyed, capital losses and, as a consequence, lost Federal revenue from taxes. Corporate taxes lost in such a storm could be as high as \$10 million or more in a single industrial area.

The city of New Bedford and the Federal Government could be saved countless millions in future years if a hurricane protection plan already advanced beyond the preliminary engineering stages was implemented in the immediate future. Congress has authorized the construction, appropriated \$1,300,000 for planning costs and in the current session has approved the expenditure of another \$500,000 to initiate construction. The project is being delayed and the city denied protection because the local government cannot afford its 30-percent share of the building cost—which would total nearly \$8 million.

The city cannot afford this amount because of serious economic problems, problems that would only be worsened if another storm was to hit. It is predicted by the engineers that a maximum-force hurricane could inflict as much as \$100 million damage in the New Bedford area. The city could be left an industrial ghost town. Even the threat of a storm costs money. One prominent manufacturer has estimated that the 35 or more industries on the waterfront in New Bedford and neighboring Fairhaven spend as much, or rather lose as much, as \$100,000 in preparing for a storm that may hopefully turn out to sea and not, after all, hit the city.

Conscious of the city's plight and the plight of similar areas, such as New London and Providence, I joined early in the session with the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], and Senators SALTONSTALL and SMITH, in filing legislation that would provide for the reduction of local contributions to hurricane flood control projects, when the locality already suffers economic hardships.

My bill, H.R. 20, which was referred to the Public Works Committee, would provide such a reduction in local contributions when the flood control project is located within a recognized labor surplus area, as determined by the Secretary of Labor. Instead, then, of a 30-percent contribution, the local interest would be required to put up a contribution, equal to that required by section 3 of the Flood Control Act of 1936; this would mean a saving to the city of New Bedford of approximately \$1,500,000.

However, action, even consideration, of my bill—filed January 3—has been delayed because the committee has not been furnished the necessary departmental reports.

This is a matter, literally, of life and death to New Bedford, and could be equally important to other towns and cities along the Atlantic coast and the Gulf of Mexico.

This bill is proper and just and would be extremely beneficial not only to New Bedford, but to the Nation as a whole. However, I know that the committee and Members of the House are hampered in their consideration of this legislation by the absence of needed reports.

In view of the disastrous effects of Hurricane Carla in Louisiana and Texas and the impending threat of the current storm, I trust the administration will provide us with the reports as soon as possible, so that with the reconvening of Congress in January, the proposal can be given the prompt attention I am confident it deserves.

Shifting of TV Channels Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, several bills and resolutions have been in-

troduced in opposition to the FCC's recent proposals to shift VHF television stations to UHF channels. Among these bills and resolutions are House Resolution 450, House Resolution 457, House Resolution 469, H.R. 9267, H.R. 9277, H.R. 9291, and H.R. 9293. I have introduced H.R. 9293, a companion bill to H.R. 9267, which was introduced on September 16, 1961, by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS]. Like my distinguished colleagues, I, too, am seriously concerned by the FCC proposals.

The FCC is proposing to shift WIS-TV on VHF channel 10 in Columbia, S.C., to a UHF channel. This switch, if allowed to happen, would deprive our State's capital of the only VHF channel assigned there. If this only VHF station in Columbia is forced to switch to UHF, I am told that an area of at least 6,000 square miles will lose the good television service it now receives from WIS-TV. Should this happen, thousands of families would not be able to receive WIS-TV as they now do. These people are, for the most part, families living in the rural and small towns, many of them in my district.

WIS-TV, broadcasting from Columbia, is the only television service that these people have from our State capital or from a South Carolina station. They depend on it for State and regional news, weather, crop reports, civil defense information, and many other types of necessary programs to keep them informed and alert to important events affecting their State. If this service is destroyed or deteriorated by switching WIS-TV to UHF, then these thousands of families would have to rely on television service from stations in other States bordering South Carolina. It would mean that their only source of information from their State capital would be lost to them and in its place would be substituted a television service designed to fit the needs of the people in the surrounding States. These services would not be oriented to the needs of the people of South Carolina as is WIS-TV's service. It would definitely not be in the public interest to allow this to take place, and I am going to vigorously oppose any such shift to UHF. As a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which is concerned with the activities of the FCC, I intend to make my opposition known both in the hearings that this committee plans to hold early next session and in the deliberations of the committee.

In its proposal on deintermixture of eight markets to all-UHF, the FCC makes it quite clear that the ultimate goal is to switch all, or almost all, television to UHF. Today we in South Carolina face the prospect of seeing over 6,000 square miles denied service from Columbia's one VHF station. Tomorrow you, too, will be faced with such prospects, for the FCC has said that other cases are contemplated later on and that they look for all, or almost all, television service to be switched from VHF to UHF.

UHF and VHF can operate and grow together. One of the problems that has held back this UHF growth is the lack of

television receivers capable of receiving both UHF and VHF. I believe, as does the FCC, that it is very necessary to insure that all sets shipped in interstate commerce have the capability to receive all channels. I strongly support such a proposal and have also included this in my bill.

All of us in this House are dedicated to serving the best interests of the people in our districts and at the same time to protecting the public interest of all the peoples of our country. The FCC's proposals on deintermixture seriously threaten these public interests nationwide. Every Member of this House should be seriously concerned with the immediate and ultimate effect it will have on the good television service now available and enjoyed by millions of families throughout our country.

Golden Jubilee of the Julius Slowacki Society, Group 1356, Polish National Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, with all due personal and professional pride, it pleases me to commend to the attention of my colleagues the Golden Jubilee of the founding of the Julius Slowacki Society, of Adams, Mass.

Organized in September 1911, this venerable group has had an honorable record in its hometown of Adams, Mass., for the past half century. Started with 13 members as a fraternal benefit organization, today it numbers 552 members. Like its parent organization, the Polish National Alliance, the society has a history of dedicated community service. Since 1925, the date of its incorporation, the list of contributions to the city of Adams, Mass., is impressive and seemingly endless, ranging from the annual sponsorship of a drum corps to the sponsorship of an English course for displaced persons preparing for U.S. citizenship. Even in times of emergency and need the Julius Slowacki Society found time to help those still living in the motherland by sending packages of food and clothing to those in distress and suffering from the effects of war.

The society is proud of this record, and justly so. Their fraternal efforts have been responsible for much of the success of their peoples in their respective professional fields as well as in their Americanism.

There is one outstanding phenomenon about the people of Poland, which holds true of the Julius Slowacki Society and those wonderful people of Polish origin or descent residing in Adams, Mass., and that is their incredible ability to maintain a national purpose and integrity against odds which would make others despair. Their fierce love for the ideals of liberty and their steadfast will to keep

it alive, have produced great fighters for our efforts at independence in the persons of Kosciusko and Pulaski.

During World War II 93 members of the Julius Slowacki Society served their country in the Armed Forces attesting to their loyalty to their new land. Those not able to don the uniform contributed to the war effort by their purchase of war savings bonds in significant amounts. Today members of the Julius Slowacki Society rank high among the donors of blood so vitally needed by the sick and infirm in their community.

The world will long remember the works of Conrad, Chopin, Marie Curie, and Ignace Paderewski, to name but a few of the great personages from Poland, the mother country of many of the members of the Julius Slowacki Society.

In commemorating this gala occasion, I think it proper for us here in the Congress, to recall the contributions made to the world by these natives of Poland, and to pay tribute to the members of the Julius Slowacki Society for their proud heritage.

Labor, Management, and Person in the Common Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D.D., bishop of Pittsburgh, at the Labor Day mass and observance on September 4, 1961, at St. Paul's Cathedral, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

LABOR, MANAGEMENT AND PERSON IN THE COMMON GOOD
SERMON

But Peter began, and said, "Now I really understand that God is not a respecter of persons, but in every nation he who fears Him and does what is right is acceptable to Him."—Acts 10:34-35.

The text which I have chosen seems especially appropriate for a gathering brought together in the spirit which characterizes this historic and remarkable Labor Day observance.

It is common enough for the representatives of management to meet in council or conference to consider the things conducive to management's best interests, to the common good of management. It is not less common for the representatives of labor similarly to meet in convention to explore ways and means to labor's best interests, to the common good of labor. But today's gathering has been made remarkable and will, one prays, prove of historic influence, because it has brought together men dedicated to the welfare of their respective groups but aware of a wider good than that of any special interests.

Here in Pittsburgh men devoted to the cause of labor and men devoted to the cause of management have come together in recognition of the reality and claims of a common good which all parties share in a decent society, the common good which is the mutual bond of men who realize that the shared things which are ours are always

more warm and sometimes more important than the things which are described by those frozen words: mine and thine (*frigida ista verba, meum et tuum.*)

Many thoughtful persons, appalled by the extremes of right and left which polarize and split our society, have long been pleading for a vital center at which could meet honest social conservatives and conscientious social liberals, men disposed to work with one another in behalf of the common good rather than to work with extremists who seek only the particular good after which their side of center aspires.

Such a vital center would seek to conciliate the particular goods of the various parties, factions, and interests of our political and economic society; it would seek the promotion of those special goods by the enrichment of that common good which all share; it would coordinate the interests and the efforts of intellectuals plus businessmen, statesmen plus generals, labor plus management, instead of encouraging the so disastrous pitting of good men against other good men in conflicts of management versus labor, generals versus statesmen, businessmen versus intellectuals—all within the same nation and served by the same common good.

This Labor Day observance is, then, a welcome reaffirmation of that common good which cannot be too frequently recalled in times of tension and conflict.

The coming together of representatives of labor and management, thus to meditate on the common good was made possible by our recognition of the truth implied in the words of St. Peter which I quoted as my text. That truth is: that more important than any of the categories to which a man may belong, is the fact that he is a person.

It is more important, because more basic, to be a person than it is to be a citizen, a tradesman, a professional man, a member of any race or class, a worker or a manager. It is better to be a good person, a worthy image of God than it is to be successful in any of the secondary functions and subordinate categories into which persons are divided. This Labor Day observance is inspired by the spirit in which St. Peter, who before had been a bit of a "racist," finally came to understand that God expects us to recognize and cooperate with all honorable persons, whatever the party or class to which they belong. After long debate on the differences between Jew and gentile, the division which chiefly bothered him, Peter finally said: "Now I really understand that God is not a respecter of persons, but in every nation (or group) he who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him."

St. Peter's tardy confession asserts that God is not a respecter of persons; it also strongly suggests that it is precisely in the goodness and worth of the person, not in considerations of nationality or class or occupation, that we men must find the unifying principle of the good society, the ultimate and positive factor in the measure or the promotion of the common good. This suggests, in turn, that our approach to today's social problems must be in terms not of the worker or the manager alone, but also and especially in terms of the person; our efforts to promote the common good in a decent society must be efforts geared to the good of labor, yes; to the good of management, yes; but, above all, to the good of the person.

In the claims of the common good and of the person lie our best hopes of reconciling the particular interests of groups otherwise destined for perpetual conflict and destructive of the program of the good persons whom God finds and we must honor in every group. Those claims impel us to think of current social problems in terms of labor, management, and persons not of labor and/or management alone.

The saving and sound balance between right and left, between conservative and liberal, must necessarily be based on something other than preoccupation with either management or labor, yet including both. A democratic society is never a society dominated by the champions of the interests of any one class. That is why a society devoted to capitalist interests only would always be undemocratic. That is also why a so-called dictatorship of the proletariat can never be represented as democratic or as a means to democracy. So, too, a truly democratic social order is never rightist or leftist in the sense that it favors management to the disadvantage of labor or labor to the embarrassment of management.

Both Christian moral teaching and democratic social ideas have found the balanced middle terms of reference between management and labor in the common good of which we have spoken, but also in the person. Christian social teaching reduces the rights of management to the rights of persons who own property, and it reduces the rights of labor to the rights of persons who own the fruits of their toil. It demands of the persons who constitute management a just recognition of the equal dignity of the persons who engage in labor, and it demands of persons who constitute labor a scrupulous recognition of the rights, inherent, and acquired, of those who constitute management. It demands of both management and labor that they have a decent regard for the rights of the rest of the community, the persons who, whether we own and operate or whether we work for others, constitute the general public; consumers are also persons and their rights and necessities are not less real than those of management and of labor.

We who live by the Christian revelation and in the traditions of democracy reject the Fascist systems because they depersonalize the individual and tend to make him a mere soulless unit in the all-important state. We reject the monstrous pretensions of communism because we recognize that the Communist totalitarian society likewise considers the person as of no importance save in terms of the impersonal collectivity. The Soviet members of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations were quite frank on this point and insisted, in language curiously close to that of Mussolini, that the individual has no existence apart from the group, and no rights save those which he derives from his existence within the group.

Fascist and Communist theories are heresy to Christianity and democracy alike, but something very like them may happen to us unless we supplement and integrate our talk about management and labor by constant insistence upon personality. It is just as easy, and just as tragic, to depersonalize men by identifying them with a class as it is to do so by identifying them with a state.

Persons are inviolable, essential, in a sense eternal. Classes are not. Classes are accidental groupings, constantly changing, both in their character and in their makeup. Persons are the foundations of society, as well as the reasons for society's existence. Society comes into being in response to the needs of personality, and all the subsequent forms which society takes are dictated and determined by the supreme purpose of all society: the service of the person. The person is ultimately greater than the society or the group. It is more important to be a person than it is to be a banker. It is more important to be a person than it is to be a bricklayer. It is more important to be a person than it is to be a professional man. All these other categories have their utility and even their necessity, but they are chiefly justified only when and as they help individuals to be distinct persons, developed personalities.

It will be a sad day for democracy and an eclipse of Christian social idealism if the rights of the person are forgotten in the battle for the rights of the worker or the owner and if individual personality suffers at the hands of a highly regimented, impersonal class system dividing society into two camps: management and labor.

If it be true that the notions of management and labor are in danger of becoming impersonal notions and that these constitute the faceless groupings of our secular society, then the reaffirmation of the Christian democratic notion of personality can again prove the liberating force to save our social system from collectivism. Whenever in western history social systems have tended to freeze, a fresh restatement of the primacy of the person has always corrected the excessive claims of the group and has upset the tyranny of the collectivity over the individual.

Some years ago Life magazine carried a remarkable article on the medieval man. It testified to the manner in which the ancient Christian notion of the immortal person saved the men of the Middle Ages from the tendency in feudal society, as in every society, to absorb and annihilate the individual.

That same concept of the person has, more than once in history, proved a liberating and an elevating force in the interests of the workingman, the soldier and the citizen. It took centuries of patient hammering by the church on the concept of personality and the dignity of the person to undermine the entrenched system of slavery which confronted Christianity in its beginnings. Labor and slavery were practically synonymous in the days of pagan Roman dominion; even the greatest of the Greeks, Plato and Aristotle, thought slavery both the natural and the necessary condition of the laboring classes. Not one of the celebrated writers of antiquity raised his voice against the system of slavery until Christianity came with its reaffirmation of the place of the person in the natural law and in revelation, above all the dignity in the supernatural order of the redeemed person, whatever his vocation or temporal destiny.

Here in America a meeting like this in Pittsburgh today greatly helps the church meet her teaching responsibility. Abroad, even in these desperate times, like religious social institutes are making a valiant effort to bring the liberating principles of moral philosophy to bear on the evolution of a new European order. Thus, in Italy the Italian Catholic Action Group has been militantly defending a concept of industry and of labor based on the declaration of Pope Pius XII that "the origin and essential end of social life should be the conservation, the development, and the perfecting of the human person." The Confederation of Christian Trade Unions, in France, has restated its declaration of principles so as to give a more prominent place to the rights of the person precisely as a person, as contrasted with the rights of the mere worker or the mere manager. The Confederation now asserts in its preamble "that man is the essential element in production, at the same time, its cause and end. For that reason the conditions of production must allow for the development of the human personality by the just satisfaction of his material, intellectual, and moral needs in the individual, family, and social order."

Here in America our problem is perhaps not so grave. We have not suffered the oppressions of reaction which have degraded labor in Europe, nor the excesses of revolution which have often brutalized worker and owner alike in parts of that continent. In the political and social order, however, it is always true that an ounce of prevention is worth a ton of cure. And so, those concerned with industrial relations do well frequently to check their concepts of management and labor against the ancient Christian and democratic standard of the primacy of the person. Neither management nor labor will be well-served nor long strengthened if the independence of the person, whether owner or worker, is impaired or imperiled. It is a good thing to have power and to be an owner. It is a proud thing to have ability and to be a worker. But it is a better thing to be a free man, a person. That is why both management and labor, in all their proposals and programs, must have for their ultimate purpose to increase the number of owners, to enoble the lot of workers, and to protect, at all costs, the centrality and sovereignty of human personality.

To this desired end, church and state, labor and management, have each mighty contributions to make. God grant that they shall be conscious of their respective responsibilities to the person and conscientious in meeting them. Thus will the "common good" prevail over every partisan good; thus will the human person prosper as good men, in every group, respecting one another, learn to fear God, but only God, and therefore to do what is right so that they may be acceptable to one another—and to God.

Muzzling Our Military Officers Helps Anti-Anti-Communist Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last December the Communist Parties, meeting in Moscow, issued a manifesto part of which declared the purpose of the Communist conspiracy to eliminate and make ineffective the anti-Communist campaigns being waged in the United States. Since that time we have been doing our best, so it seems, to help the Communists realize their goal by silencing those in the United States who dare speak out against the Communist plans to enslave the world. The latest victims of the shortsighted policy of our military leaders are two Air Force officers who dared to show to their troops the anti-Communist film "Operation Abolition." I think it is time Congress and the people make clear to the administration and those responsible for muzzling every patriotic officer who comes out against communism, that it is not our purpose to keep silent while freedom is destroyed. The following news item from this morning's Washington Post, concerning the penalizing of the two Air Force officers, should make every patriotic American realize what is happening within our military:

TWO AIR FORCE OFFICERS PENALIZED FOR FILM SHOWING

The Air Force said yesterday it removed two officers from their jobs and reprimanded them for violating orders by showing the film "Operation Abolition" to a Reserve unit during training hours.

This formal explanation differed from a statement by an Air Force spokesman Monday. The spokesman said Maj. Bob E. Cooper and Lt. Col. Fred W. Holbein were not relieved of duties at the 2648th Air Reserve

Center in Seattle, Wash., for showing the controversial film, but for disobeying orders to do something else in the training program. No disciplinary action was involved, he said.

Holbein was commander of the unit, Cooper director of training.

In its statement yesterday, the Air Force noted a Defense Department directive last March stipulating that "Operation Abolition" would not be prescribed for training personnel, but would be kept in film libraries on an "on call" basis.

It also recalled that the Air Force on April 8 issued its own instructions barring the showing of the film during training hours.

"An extensive investigation has established that 'Operation Abolition' was shown during training hours at two officially prescribed Reserve collateral training meetings held on April 17 and 18, 1961, at the 2648th Air Reserve Center," the Air Force said.

"This showing of the film was a violation of the Air Force instructions."

Establishing a U.S. Arms Control Agency

SPEECH
OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 19, 1961

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9118) to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must oppose H.R. 9118 to establish a U.S. Arms Control Agency.

I use the word regret because I yield to no one in my desire for peace and reduction of armaments, and a vote against the bill might be interpreted by the unthinking as a vote in favor of war and against peace.

My opposition to the bill is that it is completely unnecessary. There already exists adequate authority in the executive branch of the Government, and, specifically, in the Department of State, for the conduct of research, planning, and negotiation working toward international bilateral and multilateral treaties providing for the limitation of armaments. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee during debate conceded that all of the functions of the proposed new Agency could presently be performed by the U.S. Disarmament Agency in the Department of State.

That is where these functions should be performed.

If the personnel of the existing Agency is insufficient, or if the funds for these purposes are insufficient, all the administration has to do is to ask for additional appropriations to strengthen the Agency.

Not only is the establishment of a new independent Agency outside the State Department unnecessary but, in my opinion, it is harmful.

It will further weaken the State Department when it desperately needs to be strengthened. It will fragment and diffuse the conduct of our foreign relations when the need is for a clearer and more

definite pinpointing of responsibility in the arm of our Government responsible for conducting our relations with foreign governments.

Mr. Chairman, my belief that the State Department needs to be strengthened is one of long standing. During the Eisenhower administration, I vigorously opposed two reorganization plans in 1953 which removed from the Department of State certain functions previously vested in the Department, and created new autonomous, independent agencies with only nebulous, if any, supervision and control remaining in the Department of State. I refer to Reorganization Plan No. 7 creating the Foreign Operations Administration and Reorganization Plan No. 8, which removed the U.S. Information Agency from the Department of State and gave it independent status.

Mr. Chairman, it is significant that my position with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 7 has been vindicated. After a few years' experience with the autonomous foreign aid agency, it was returned to the Department of State. I have long urged that the same return to the Department of State be taken with respect to the U.S. Information Agency.

Because I believe H.R. 9118 moves in exactly the wrong direction by splitting off from the State Department one of the most important of its responsibilities in the conduct of foreign relations, and for that reason would impede rather than promote progress toward disarmament and peace, I feel compelled to vote against the bill.

Is the U.N. at the Crossroads?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, prior to the untimely death of the Secretary General, grave doubts existed in the minds of many as to whether the U.N. could survive against the inevitable onslaughts of those dedicated to destroy it.

The following provocative editorial was written prior to the death of Dag Hammarskjöld, and appeared in the September 18 issue of the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily. Certainly the fears expressed have been magnified many times since that unfortunate incident.

May I suggest that if you do nothing more, you at least take time to read the last paragraph of this editorial. In it might well be the formula for survival:

THE UNITED NATIONS

It looks to us as if the session of the United Nations General Assembly which opens tomorrow will be the most crucial in the short history of the world organization. The resumption by the Soviet Union and the United States of tests of nuclear weapons signifies the extent of the crisis, of the wide gap between the increasing destructive strength of the so-called great powers and

the constructive strength of the organization which was established in 1945 to secure the peace.

We would think, however, that the breakdown of the Geneva negotiations on permanently banning such tests, their resumption by the Soviet Union and then the United States, makes it very clear that the idea of the United Nations was sound, practical, and wise. Nations, acting unilaterally or attempting to solve their differences face to face, cannot be counted on to stop short of armed conflict. Which is to say that weak as the United Nations may be, it is the only presently conceivable instrument that gives hope of preventing war.

The factors which contribute to the weakness of the United Nations, in our opinion, are the tradition of national sovereignty—which leads some nations, at times when they so choose, to bypass the U.N.—and the ideological conflict between West and East which leads each side to attempt to use the United Nations as a means of gaining special advantage here or there on the globe. The U.N. tactics shortly after entering the Congo brought accusations from the East that the West was employing the international organization to save some form of colonialism in that country. And the subsequent proposals of the East for changes in the U.N. executive structure brought charges from the West that the East was thereby endeavoring to control the United Nations—or at least to get into a position where it could stop the U.N. from doing anything the East didn't like.

That the United Nations has endured strains such as this, and such as the all too numerous occasions when large nations have decided and done things without bothering to consult the U.N., is an indication of a general awareness of its necessity. We would guess that even those nations, which, by their behavior, have helped to weaken the U.N., have a feeling that its existence must be insured. But we also think that unless great nations reduce the strains they have been putting on the U.N., it could well be that it will go the way of other efforts at international cooperation to prevent war.

How could the strains be reduced in the present General Assembly? In two ways, it seems to us. First, by an explicit willingness on the part of all to refer to the appropriate U.N. body any and all international problems that threaten world peace; and the explicit willingness to abide by whatever decisions the U.N. makes. Second, by abandoning national positions that, whatever their real basic intent, convey a strong impression of having been designed to further special national interests. Examples of such positions are the Soviet insistence on a three-member Secretariat which can act only in unanimity—and the 10-year U.S. insistence that the Peoples Republic of China be kept out of the U.N.

Unless the great powers are willing to search for methods of this sort to strengthen the U.N.'s authority, we just do not see how the organization is going to survive. And if it doesn't, neither, in our opinion, will humanity.

Sandy Hook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Sandy Hook, located at the gateway to New York Harbor, is known to Members of Congress; it also marks

the northernmost part of the New Jersey coastline along the Atlantic Ocean. For a number of years this area has been occupied by the Army as part of the defenses of New York City but other Government agencies, such as the Coast Guard and the Lighthouse Service, also have installations there.

Sandy Hook lends itself to recreational uses and for some time plans have been made, awaiting the release by the Army of sufficient land, for the development of a public park and recently there have been indications that a portion of the area not used by the Army will be made available for that purpose.

On the face of it this is a very worthwhile idea but there are some practical problems which must be solved before the park becomes a reality. The most important one is how land traffic can reach the park without causing serious traffic congestion. Recognizing this situation, the mayor and council of the borough of Rumson, N.J., which is my hometown located nearby, adopted a unanimous resolution dated September 14, 1961, in opposition to the plan for a recreational park which is appended to the conclusion of these remarks. This is a most serious problem to the resident taxpayers of that area and it is imperative that attention be given to the situation complained about before any definite action is taken about opening Sandy Hook to the public.

A copy of the resolution is as follows:

Councilman Halleran offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"Whereas the State of New Jersey has made a request to the Federal Government for the acquisition of Sandy Hook for use as a public park; and

"Whereas Sandy Hook exists on the Sea Bright Peninsula where road facilities are inadequate for present traffic; and

"Whereas county route 520, otherwise known as Rumson Road, is the principal access to Sandy Hook from the west and also exists on the Sea Bright Peninsula; and

"Whereas route 520 passes through the full length of the borough of Rumson, is narrow, and is not suitable to handle heavy traffic; and

"Whereas on weekends during the summer months there is at present a serious traffic problem on Rumson Road, especially where it approaches the Sea Bright-Rumson Bridge: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the borough council of the borough of Rumson hereby opposes the use of Sandy Hook as a public park until alternate routes are provided and conditions made suitable for the handling of the heavy traffic which would be approaching and departing from the proposed park; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to Representative JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, State Senator Richard R. Stout, and the Monmouth County Board of Chosen Freeholders."

Resolution seconded by Councilman Sundermeyer and carried on the following roll-call vote:

In the affirmative: Councilmen Harding, Banks, Halleran, Cronan, Sundermeyer, and Callman.

In the negative: none.

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the governing board of the borough of Rumson, State of New Jersey, at a meeting held September 14, 1961.

A. A. KERR,
Borough Clerk.

Ford Motor Co. Enters Space With Both Feet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address:

FORD MOTOR CO. ENTERS SPACE WITH BOTH FEET

(Address of John Dykstra, president, Ford Motor Co., before the National Defense Transportation Association at Denver, Colo., on Tuesday, Sept. 19, 1961)

I am very glad to have the opportunity to address this group. As a member of the National Defense Transportation Association, our company shares wholeheartedly the goal of encouraging understanding and cooperation between industry and the Defense Establishment. In my judgment, the achievement of this goal is one of the paramount needs of our country and can be one of the most important contributions to our national security.

I certainly do not want to imply that Government and industry cannot, and do not, work together. But I do believe that the defense potential of American industry can be realized fully only if industry is looked upon as a permanent partner of the Government in the continuing effort to conceive, design, develop, and produce new and better defense equipment. By the same token, industry has its own duty to seek out ways of making the maximum contribution.

Industry has always been ready to respond when the Government has called upon it in time of war. This no longer is enough. The grave dangers and the great opportunities of today place upon us a more exacting responsibility. We in industry must examine our own companies to determine how our management, our resources, and our talents can best be used to advance the total national effort.

Detroit was once known as the arsenal of democracy. In recent years, we have seen that title begin to slip away from us. Some years ago, Ford Motor Co. decided that in recognition of its obligation to our country, we should become once again a substantial contributor to the defense effort—not merely as a manufacturer, but as a designer and developer of the most advanced kinds of equipment. Because Ford Motor Co.'s history so closely parallels the development and changes in our industrial society since the turn of the century, our experience in coming to terms with this challenge may be interesting and useful to you and others.

Ford Motor Co. now is preparing its bid to manufacture the biggest, most powerful American entry in the space race—the first-stage booster of the giant Saturn vehicle. This is only one sign that we are moving into the defense and space business with both feet. We are determined to be in the vanguard of our country's effort to regain space-age leadership. Our scientific laboratory in Dearborn has become one of the world's leading centers of basic research. Our aeronautic division in Newport Beach, Calif., is steadily expanding its role in space-age technology. Our special military vehicles operation is now producing the Ford-designed successor to the jeep, and developing new trucks that we believe will surpass their military predecessors by a wide margin.

These particular activities are, perhaps, less important than the decision that lies

behind them. A primary goal of Ford Motor Co. is to contribute whatever we can, and as much as we can, to the Nation's space and security objectives. The vast facilities, the scientific assets and the management ability of our company are pledged to this policy.

In discussing this development today, I have two main objectives. Frankly, Ford's role in the space industry is not as well known as it should be, and we would like to improve that. Second, since our past experience is not unique, I hope to arrive at some general conclusions about industrial production in the age of space that may be of special interest to you.

The automobile industry has a long and honorable history as a producer of defense goods. During World War I, we made extensive production and engineering contributions. The most dramatic of Ford's World War II efforts was the Willow Run bomber plant, where we applied the technique of assembly line mass production to the manufacture of airplanes. Aircraft specialists at that time thought that automobile methods were unsuitable for aircraft production but the mile-long Willow Run assembly line reached and then exceeded spectacular bomber production quotas.

During that period, Ford turned out planes by the thousands, and engines, vehicles and other equipment by the hundreds of thousands. But its contribution cannot be measured in volume of units alone. Our engineers found literally thousands of ways to improve the design and assembly of this equipment, changes which improved quality and interchangeability, while reducing costs.

During the Korean conflict, we again became a mass producer of military equipment—tanks, tank engines, rockets, and bomber wings. Between 1950 and 1959, our aircraft engine division in Chicago built more than 3,000 Pratt & Whitney 28-cylinder reciprocating engines, and more than 8,000 J-57 turbojets.

Again our own specialists contributed engineering, design and production changes that saved the taxpayer money while improving the quality and delivery rates of these engines.

Other auto manufacturers had comparable production records during these periods of national crisis. Indeed, it is safe to say that world history during the last half-century might have been quite different if our industry had not then been, in fact, the arsenal of democracy. This enormous diversified manufacturing and assembly facilities of the industry, its pool of experienced managers, its network of supplier relationships, its engineering talent and its unequalled ability to mass produce complicated products were ready made for the needs of conventional warfare.

I can think of no other industry with this much depth and breadth of resources.

Ford, for example, in addition to having manufactured military equipment, automobiles, trucks and tractors, is a primary producer of steel, glass, plastics, paints, and electrical goods—to name just a few. In each of these areas—as in many others—we have expert knowledge and capability. In many fields of manufacturing technology, Ford Motor Co. has contributed major advances. It is hard to imagine any problem of engineering or manufacturing that a company of this highly integrated nature would not be competent to tackle.

Today, however, the Defense Establishment needs more from industry than outstanding engineering and manufacturing capabilities. With the cold war gripping the world, the military seeks quickly to translate new scientific knowledge into radically new and better weapons and equipment. There now is a vital need for companies that have the scientific and technological capacity to come

up with new ideas and new designs as well as the management and facilities to carry these ideas through to final production.

Consequently, we at Ford Motor Co. knew that if we were to have as one of our primary goals the contribution of whatever we could, and as much as we could, to the Nation's space and security objectives—if we were to pledge our vast facilities, our assets and our management to this policy—then we certainly would need skills beyond those of mass production. We would need a solid research foundation that would be broader and deeper than our normal product and engineering research. This could not be established overnight.

In our own case, we started building that foundation shortly after World War II. We could see the aircraft industry being revolutionized by jet propulsion. Atomic energy, plastics, and new electronic devices all served to impress upon us the enormous industrial potential of pure research. We were convinced, and still are, that future discoveries in fuels, in materials, in energy conversion, in electronics and in other fields would open up entirely new directions both for our products and our manufacturing technology. In short, we were convinced that the future in our industry, as in others, would belong to companies that could exploit the frontiers of scientific discovery.

The result was the establishment in 1951, of the Ford Scientific Laboratory. In setting up the laboratory, we recognized that science cannot be harnessed full time to specific technological objectives. By definition, scientific research is concerned with the unknown. Where it will lead, what practical benefits it will discover, no man can predict. To tie scientific research down to specific product goals is to limit its potential and foreclose discoveries that cannot even be imagined.

Freedom, therefore, has been the watchword of our scientific policies. Approximately half of our research program is devoted to basic studies in physics, chemistry and metallurgy. Within this area, our scientists follow their research wherever it leads, and no man in the company has the right to divert them. Another way in which we strive to protect the continuity and freedom of research is by placing our scientific laboratory on a 5-year budget which guarantees continuing support of research projects regardless of ups and downs in our business and our earnings. We believe that we were one of the first industrial corporations to place basic scientific research projects on a guaranteed long-range budget.

Our research policies and our new laboratory facilities have made it possible for us to attract some of the world's outstanding scientists.

In stressing our basic research program, I do not mean to imply that we have become a company of eggheads, unconcerned with practical results. On the contrary, half of our scientific research program is devoted to long-range applied research—to the task of discovering practical applications of fundamental new knowledge. The point is that in our scientific research we are not bound by the experience, the traditions, or the inherited men and facilities of the past. We have been able, rather, to start fresh and work toward an ideal environment which encourages creative research and manufacturing innovations.

Nor have we neglected the engineering side of our business. We have expanded our engineering groups, both at the staff level and in our operating divisions, and have created a special manufacturing engineering research center to develop new testing techniques and new tools. As a result of the close cooperation of all these people, we are learning more about the properties and use of various materials than many of the companies that specialize in their production.

But as we move further into the space age, we realized that it was not enough to add new research to our proven production ability if we were to contribute our full share to national security. We would have to go further.

By 1956, we were ready. With the establishment of Aeronutronic, we made our bid to reverse the declining participation of Ford Motor Co. in the defense effort.

Unlike the Scientific Laboratory, Aeronutronic was established with no thought of making a direct contribution to automotive technology, though we do expect its indirect contributions in the years ahead to be substantial. The new member of the Ford family was created, rather, to make important and original contributions to the Nation's space, missile and defense programs.

It is easy to see now how Aeronutronic was the logical outgrowth of our expanded scientific and engineering efforts.

As an automotive company, we have concentrated our research in areas which might lead to innovations in materials; in the sources, storage and conversion of energy; and in electronic control and communications devices.

Simply reciting this list makes it clear that our next step had to be into space and missiles. Our long-run scientific and technological requirements as an automotive manufacturer are virtually the same as the requirements of missile and space development. Tough, light, easily formed, heat and friction resistant materials are equally important to the designer of automobiles and the designer of space vehicles. Likewise, each has a compelling interest in new and better ways of storing and releasing energy and in the multiple uses of electronic devices.

Thus, Aeronutronic was not an alien body, grafted on to Ford Motor Co. It was a logical outgrowth of our needs, and a way of making fuller and more economical use of our existing scientific and technological capacities, as well as a way of increasing our contribution to the Nation's strength and security.

However, we had no illusion that we could enter the space age halfway, or do a useful job with our left hand. We knew that Aeronutronic would have to be set up as an independent entity, quite capable of standing on its own feet.

Starting with a handful of people 5 years ago, Aeronutronic's research and development staff currently consists of 3,000 engineers, scientists, management, manufacturing and support personnel.

Already it is making major contributions to the Army, Navy, Air Force, and National Aeronautic and Space Administration programs as well as to basic scientific knowledge.

Our defense and space-age activities are strengthened immeasurably by drawing upon the resources of the worldwide Ford organization.

For example, our Dearborn laboratories have developed new techniques for producing superstrong steel and for bonding graphite to metals that will probably find their first applications in space vehicles.

At the same time, the independent research and development activities of Aeronutronic are virtually certain to contribute unforeseeable innovations to automotive technology.

We expect this exchange of ideas to continue and to grow. We also expect that as our research expands into new areas we will make discoveries that will affect great changes in our entire operations.

In addition, as many of you may have heard, Ford Motor Co. last week announced plans to purchase the assets of Philco Corp. Henry Ford II said then that our purpose was to broaden our operations and to make possible a fuller participation by Ford in the national defense and space effort.

What implications, then, does our experience have for others in the defense transportation field?

First, I think we must all recognize the fast-growing importance of scientific research in all our activities. We must support such research to the best of our financial ability. But we must also take advantage of every technological development to improve the usefulness and the quality of our products, our facilities and our tools.

Second, we must stop thinking only in terms of traditional products, materials and methods, and let our research lead us toward new and better ones.

Third, while today most companies concentrate on a group of products closely related in terms of use or manufacturing processes, in the future, a company's product line may be determined more and more by its research.

Thus, in the past, Ford has been a volume producer of automobiles and trucks, and its defense production has been closely allied to its basic business—military vehicles, tanks and engines. Today, it still is a major producer of vehicles, and growing stronger in this field every day. But at the same time our research activities are leading us into additional areas—into electronics, special materials and special fuels. Our future growth can well follow still unforeseen paths. We welcome this challenge.

Finally, gentlemen, I would like to make one more point this morning:

When I started, I said that American industry must be a full working partner of our Government. I feel, and I am sure you will agree, that as industrial citizens we have the same civic obligation as do individual citizens.

But I think we have a further obligation. We must keep ourselves always ready to serve, without notice or warning. As I see it, this means that we must keep our financial muscles strong, our facilities up-to-date and flexible, and our management highly trained.

We hear a lot now about how small the world has grown. Gentlemen, it has grown small only in terms of time and distance. It has grown tremendously big and complicated in terms of its problems and the way these problems can be solved. If we must have a strong Government to lead us through this difficult period, I think we also must have strong businesses to support that Government, businesses with the ability to carry their share of the national burden. Our businesses must be strong in management, strong in production and research ability, and financially healthy to do the big jobs we will be called upon to do in the years ahead.

We must continually expand and improve our plants and our tools, and give our scientists freedom to explore new areas. By the same token, we must be able to make the best possible products for today's market and sell them at a profit sufficient to permit increased investment in space-age programs and facilities.

If we do this, we will serve not only our stockholders, but our broader national duty as well.

West Virginia: First in Rehabilitating the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the latest summary report by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, covering the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1961, reveals

a notable "first" for the State of West Virginia. For the second year in succession West Virginia ranks first in the Nation in the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons, on the basis of the number rehabilitated in proportion to population.

During the past year an average of 188 disabled persons per 100,000 population achieved rehabilitation, the highest mark ever set by a State and nearly four times the national average of 51 per 100,000 population. Not only did West Virginia lead in per capita rehabilitations, but also ranked fourth in the absolute number of rehabilitations behind the more populous States of New York, Pennsylvania, and Georgia.

An achievement of this kind can only result from determined and meaningful effort on the part of those responsible for administration of the program. I am proud to say that our State government has recognized the value of the rehabilitation program for many years, and has lent it strong support through the appropriation of funds and the encouragement of the staff specialists who actually perform the rehabilitation functions.

I believe recognition should be given at this time to those dedicated staff members of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation of the West Virginia Department of Education whose efforts made this ranking possible, and particularly to F. Ray Power, director of the division, whose stature as a leader in this most humane of enterprises has grown steadily through the years.

The State program has also enjoyed strong support from among community leaders and solid backing from the medical profession. Not long ago I had occasion to discuss the rehabilitation program with a leading physician, Dr. Ralph H. Nestmann of Charleston, and I was very much pleased to learn of the strong interest of the medical profession in the furtherance of the program. The social advantages are appealing, but I believe too few of us are aware of the solid economic advantages which cause this program to return more than a dollar's worth of net economic gain for the Nation from every dollar invested.

Any dispassionate study of the results which have been obtained must convince a fairminded person of the worth of this program. Not long ago I had an opportunity to read a significant documented work on this subject which I can recommend to all of you. It is entitled "Rehabilitation: A Community Challenge" and was written by W. Scott Allan. The numerous examples cited in this book of persons who were removed from the category of community dependents and transformed into self-sufficient and self-reliant citizens impressed me greatly.

Industrial accidents will always be with us, and some forms of employment will always be very hazardous. Yet, the advances recorded by this program indicate that we can retrain and rehabilitate those who have met misfortune and the record of accomplishment speaks for

continued and growing support in the years ahead. Of all of the Federal-State programs for which we provide matching funds there is none which can offer a better prospect for realization of a definite social and economic profit and project a stronger ray of hope to those who are in great need.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SPOKANE, WASH., September 7, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I wish to register my approval of the resolution (H. Res. 211) to provide a Special House Committee on Captive Nations which you introduced during this session. I commend you for your efforts, and sincerely wish this resolution will be considered and passed. I am writing my Representative urging his support of the measure.

The enslaved and captive nations of the Communist criminal conspiracy will never find the courage and strength to overthrow their oppressors unless they feel the free world stands behind them.

I hope you will continue your courageous efforts in the interests of these millions of oppressed peoples.

Sincerely,

CHARLES R. WOLFE, M.D.

FLINT, MICH., September 9, 1961.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

DEAR SIR: Let me extend my heartiest congratulations to you as author of House Resolution 211.

A special House Committee on Captive Nations would inspire the hundreds of enslaved people throughout the world with new hopes for freedom and be a permanent reminder to Khrushchev that we have not forgotten the captive nations.

I have written to my Congressman, CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN urging his support of a special Committee on Captive Nations. Keep up the good work; I'm with you.

Respectfully,

ERIC G. PETERSEN.

SEPTEMBER 5, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congratulations for your House Resolution 211 to provide a special House Committee on Captive Nations. Believe you have a good idea here, something to lend encouragement to the Iron Curtain captive countries and let them know we haven't entirely forgotten them, especially since we were so instrumental in getting the biggest portion of them behind the Iron Curtain and in the predicament they now find themselves in.

Yours truly,

Dr. and Mrs. E. CLARENCE SALTER.

TORRANCE, CALIF.,

September 7, 1961.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: We heartily endorse House Resolution 211 providing a special House Committee on Captive Nations. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

STUART SMITH.

RICHMOND, IND., September 9, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: You are to be commended for introducing House Resolution 211.

I am certain you will have the support of Congressman RALPH HARVEY.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

G. MERLE JOHNSON.

P.S.—May I have one of your autographed photos?

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,

September 1, 1961.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: House Resolution 211 would certainly serve as the most systematically organized method of reporting on the enslaved people throughout the world, thanks to your very inspiring efforts to see that this bill is passed.

ALICE PURDUE.

BIRMINGHAM, MICH.,

September 12, 1961.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to add my support to House Resolution 211 which calls for the establishment for a special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

These people behind the Iron Curtain have been tragically forgotten for many years. They are our true allies as they have a very real understanding of communism. We could only hope that our own State Department understood communism nearly as well as people who have lived under it.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Oakland County's very excellent Congressman

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, in the hope that he too will support your resolution.

Very truly yours,

R. J. McGRATH.

MIRALESTE, CALIF., September 5, 1961.
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD:

You are to be commended for the authorship of your fine bill, House Resolution 211. If there were more time put into such affirmative thinking, we wouldn't be in the governmental mess we are now in.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN L. BARRETT,
A Voter.

The Role of the Christian in Today's World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the world of tomorrow will be won through an idea, and no idea can be defeated with military might. Whether our grandchildren will, as Khrushchev has warned, "live under communism" or remain free depends upon the dedication of those committed to win the world. The following article from the Chicago Sunday Tribune magazine points the challenge Christians face in the battle for the minds of men:

CHRISTIANS CAN WIN THE WORLD IF THEY CARE ENOUGH TO TRY

(By Harold Blake Walker, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Evanston)

We are increasingly aware that we are involved in the life of a world community. What happens in the Congo has repercussions in New York and San Francisco. The world has become one world, and we cannot separate ourselves from it. Hunger anywhere is a problem everywhere, and ignorance anywhere is a danger everywhere.

We live in a world neighborhood in which we are mutually dependent on the whole. Henry Smith Leiper, distinguished clergyman, put the truth in a simple and eloquent way when he wrote that if we could compress our world neighborhood of 2½ billion people into a community of 1,000 it would break down in an interesting fashion.

There would be, says Dr. Leiper, 60 Americans in the community and 940 representing the remainder of the world. The 60 Americans would be receiving one-half the total income of the entire community. It could be added that they would be riding in their automobiles on rubber tires, using 90 percent of the rubber produced by the impoverished in their neighborhood.

At their coffee breaks they would be drinking most of the coffee grown by their less fortunate neighbors. On their chocolate cakes and pies and candy bars they would be using virtually all of the cocoa produced by the remainder of the community.

The 60 Americans, Dr. Leiper went on, would have 15 times as many possessions as all the rest of their 940 neighbors combined. While the 60 citizens of the United States would be well fed, comfortably housed, and thoroughly amused, most of the other 940 would be hungry, sick, ignorant, and crowded 10 to a room. The 60 Americans would have food packed to overflowing in expensive storage facilities, toward which

the rest of the community looked with both envy and resentment.

More than half the people in the neighborhood never would have heard of Jesus Christ or what He taught and for what He lived and died. On the other hand, more than half would be hearing about Karl Marx, Nicolai Lenin, and Nikita Khrushchev.

If the Christian portion of the community, 36 in the United States and 300 in the remainder of the neighborhood, makes small effort to touch the rest of the world and the Communist half is dedicated to the conversion of everybody, the end character of the community is obvious.

If, on the other hand, the Christians are dedicated evangelists, sensitive to the spiritual and physical needs of their fellows, and concerned for their welfare, the struggle for the minds and hearts of men can end quite differently. It all depends on how much Christians care about their faith and about the beliefs and the welfare of their neighbors.

We cannot live and survive alone, for we are debtors to the whole community. Our science and our industry are linked to the science and industry of the world. Our faith is ours because men and women of other races and Nations gave it birth, and still others cared enough to nourish it through the centuries.

Our knowledge has its roots in Greece and Rome and we are heirs to it. What we have built in our portion of the community was made possible partly because we stood on the shoulders of giants in other lands and times. We are, as Paul said in his day, "debtors both to the Greeks and to barbarians."

Profits Without Honor?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence has written an editorial for the September 25, 1961, issue of the U.S. News & World Report which discusses efforts of the Kennedy administration to keep the steel industry from raising prices, yet at the same time, go along with labor's demands for higher wages. Mr. Lawrence points to the adverse effect of the steel industry's ability to satisfy obligations to its stockholders, incurred under the profit system. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROFITS WITHOUT HONOR?

(By David Lawrence)

Profits are getting a black eye these days. Labor's demands are unrestrained. But President Kennedy has set a pattern for industry generally in America as he requests all the steel companies—regardless of their individual obligations—to absorb higher costs of labor without increasing any prices.

These businesses—in which many billions of dollars of other people's money are invested—are supposed to continue to pay debts, buy the products of other industries which today are raising their prices, purchase new plant and equipment, and also pay dividends to stockholders out of diminished earnings.

Not since 1958 have the steel companies, for instance, raised their prices, but they have been forced to grant big wage increases. The President, unfortunately, has not urged

the labor unions to forgo the substantial increase they have been scheduled to get on October 1, though he steadfastly insists that the steel companies must not raise their prices.

Why has the Kennedy administration adopted this one-sided course and shown plainly such indifference to the obligations of companies to their stockholders incurred under the profit system?

Everyone who runs a successful business knows that, when wages go up steadily, prices must go up, too, or else profit margins will be narrowed and, in some instances, actual losses will be incurred.

In a free market, the consumer resists price increases that he cannot afford and begins to buy less costly substitutes. No management with a grain of sense ever pushes the price of its products beyond what most of the customers will pay. The tendency instead is to charge a price that will bring sales.

If we are to have in America a competitive system, if a people's capitalism is to continue to compete against the socialism that the Communists repeatedly extol, and if there is to be some kind of balance between need and greed, the less the Government of the United States meddles with the operation of a free market, the greater the chance of building up, rather than wrecking, our whole economic system.

We have had sad experiences with price control in World War I and World War II and during the Korean war. These periods are to no small extent responsible for our plight today. For "wage and price control" by Federal edict is a misnomer. It turns out, as a rule, to be price control without wage control. Labor has enough political influence to get steady increases, while management must pay the penalty for its lack of such influence.

We face this dilemma: Either the private-enterprise system will find a way to impress on each economic group—labor as well as management—that there must be a fair and equitable attitude toward each other and that politics and individual lust for power within unions must not goad the labor leaders to extremes, or else the whole private-enterprise system will be broken down.

There are, regrettably, in the Kennedy administration many advisers and in Congress many influential Members who are obsessed with the idea that the Government must sooner or later run almost everything. So profits are treated as if they were dishonorable. The public is asked to believe that large business pays no heed to consumer resistance and that it will push prices up regardless of the diminished sales and consumer attitudes. This is an indefensible doctrine.

A free-market system can flourish only if every part of it is free. To publicize profits as mere greed, without denouncing the tendency of labor unions to use their collective-bargaining power to extort wage increases to the limit, is sheer demagoguery. It can only sow the seeds of serious trouble in the economy.

Profits are not dishonorable. Profits are used to pay billions of dollars in taxes for the support of the Federal Government. Without this tax money, our Government would face bankruptcy.

For the system we have in America is not accurately called a profit system. It is a profit-and-loss system. Money must be borrowed to pay for expansion, and this can be paid back to the lenders only if there is a profit.

Responsibility in business is not given its deserved place in our society. Irresponsibility in government is creating a disregard for the whole basis of the profit-and-loss system. Unless checked by a new sense of responsibility among the politicians, including the highest officials of the Kennedy ad-

ministration, we may find the disciples of Nikita Khrushchev someday gloating that his prediction of a socialistic economy in America for our grandchildren did come true.

Let us stop disparaging the profits system and private capitalism. For there is nothing disgraceful about earning money to pay debts or to pay stockholders sufficient rent for their money and thus persuade them to continue to invest their savings in American enterprises. And the simple judgment of what is adequate cannot be made for them by government. It can only be made in a free market. For this is the American way.

Cross-Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been a strong supporter of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. Such a canal would supply the missing link to an inland waterway chain that now stretches from Palatka, Fla., up the Atlantic Coast, through the St. Lawrence Seaway, down the Mississippi Valley, and along the Gulf of Mexico coast to St. Marks, Fla., and consequently would benefit the entire eastern seaboard of the United States.

Please bear in mind, also, that with the present emphasis on space exploration and the building of new facilities at Cape Canaveral, this canal would be of tremendous assistance in the transportation of materiel from inland points to the cape.

During World War II, priceless cargoes and innumerable lives were lost in shipping off our Florida coast from attacks by enemy submarines, which might have been prevented if this canal had been in operation.

Recently it was announced that our future military policy would include development of conventional forces and methods of warfare. Assurance of adequate transportation is essential to such a buildup.

The President's budget this year, Mr. Speaker, contained an item of \$195,000 for a meager start on this cross-Florida barge canal. Our House Committee on Appropriations refused that amount and allowed only \$50,000 for a study. It is my fervent hope that the other body will restore the full amount and the House conferees will recommend retention of the \$195,000 for this important project.

Let me say, frankly, that I have a great personal interest in this canal. It will pass through three counties in my district—Levy, Putnam, and Nassau. In fact, all of the counties in my district stand to benefit. Once the canal is built, I feel sure it would open up for development the entire Suwannee River waterway system and would make possible a boom in north-central Florida, which in turn would make its contribution to the economy of the Nation. We need a booming economy to support our vast and costly military defense.

A Need of a Shelter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues an editorial entitled "A Need of a Shelter." This editorial was written by Mr. Bob Thomas, the editor of the Groveland Press, an excellent newspaper in my home county owned by Mr. and Mrs. Alden M. Drury, whose son Allen is pretty well known on the Hill.

What Mr. Thomas has to say in his editorial is both timely and timeless, and I am sure each of you will find in it food for serious thought:

A NEED OF A SHELTER

It is perhaps apropos that we dwell for a moment on fallout, or disaster, shelters. And this for three reasons: the Berlin crisis, the Cuban situation, and the hurricane season.

From the top, then:

Khrushchev, in Berlin, continues to throw little tests at the West. He watches the reaction of NATO, hopeful of spotting a weakness at which to aim the Red wedge of communism, for it is the aim of communism to divide and conquer.

In Cuba the Red threat sits poised 90 miles from American soil. American military aircraft can travel that distance in 4½ minutes. We would kid ourselves to think Russia does not have planes capable of a like feat. It is commonsense to know Canaveral and Vandenberg, with American SAC bases, would be prime targets in the event of world war III.

These facts alone point to a need for fallout shelters, for most certainly communism does not plan to conquer the West at the conference table.

The question, then, would seem to be is this the hour for fallout shelters?

As for a disaster shelter—your answer would be as good as ours for we are no closer to God than you.

Our humble opinion, for what it is worth, is that America faces a greater threat to its safety than fallout, and that threat is communistic ideology. Around the world communism spreads the vilification that America is a war-hunger nation intent on ravaging all of the earth's souls. It points to America as a country desirous of bringing all peoples to their knees under the capitalistic whip in the hands of the Rockefellers, the Gettys, the Du Ponts, and the Kennedys.

That is the threat of the hour.

What America needs at the moment is not a fallout shelter, but an education. It needs to inform itself in the art of propaganda. It needs to carry the word of democracy and to fight the lies of communism with the truth. Americans need to turn to their neighbors and speak the word of Americanism. Americanism and its heritage should be roared from the rostrum and preached from the pulpit. It should be sung from the steeples.

This, then, would not only be our shelter but our fort.

Where do we begin? We begin at home. We tell our children that they might tell their children, and their children again. We tell them of America's beginning on a rocky coast of New England. We tell them of hunger and privation and of a first Thanksgiving. We tell them of Indian wars and exploration, and of a man named Washington and a winter at Valley Forge.

We tell them of Bunker Hill and Gettysburg and Iwo Jima. We tell them everything. We tell them of the Tea Pot Dome scandal, and what historians permit about Harding, and we tell them of back-door spending. We should not be proud of our shortcomings—but they have not buried us; they have given us more reason to become strong.

You say this is a small beginning? We remind you that it was not too many years ago when communism was the one small voice of Karl Marx. And regardless of the Marxist theory and what his communism has become, there was a time when his voice was alone. Communism, too, had a small beginning.

The truth—to counter lies—this must be our first shelter.

Civil Defense or Civic Intelligence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a most important letter sent to me by Henry B. Waskow, executive secretary of the Baltimore Teachers' Union. This letter was written by the union to the Baltimore superintendent of public instruction and is an interesting comment on the proposed civil defense program:

SEPTEMBER 16, 1961.

Dr. GEORGE B. BRAIN,
Superintendent of Public Instruction,
Baltimore, Md.

DEAR DR. BRAIN: In your message of greeting to teachers on September 7, you mentioned that a survey is to be made of the amount of work needed to install fallout shelters in each school.

Vigilance concerning the welfare of our children is of first importance. How best to protect them is the concern of all citizens. Teachers have perhaps been more zealous than most citizens in cooperating with civil defense in the past. While guiding students in air-raid drills, crawling under cafeteria tables, taking cover on cement corridor floors a la World War II, many teachers have felt the futility of such methods of dealing with the H-bomb.

We teachers, who will share with our pupils the security of these methods, are convinced that the building of fallout shelters is no improvement.

We call your attention to the statement in his report to Congress of Secretary of Defense McNamara (the Sun, Aug. 2, 1961) that fallout shelters are good only for cities which do not suffer direct hits. It is generally agreed that in case of war Baltimore will be a primary target. The recent articles on civil defense in the Evening Sun demonstrated that Baltimore could be completely destroyed by H-bombs, with devastation spreading for many miles around. Lethal fallout is equally annihilating. Secretary McNamara, in his report, stated further that "a near-miss upwind from a large city would still wipe out the city's whole population, leaving the city undamaged."

We trust that you will keep these warnings in mind in your conferences with local civil defense authorities. The building of bomb shelters in school buildings may create among parents and children a false belief in the physical safety of the students.

But in the nuclear age, our children's physical safety can no longer be achieved

through the physical means of steel and concrete. Knowledge, intellectual ability, and creativity in dealing with the new demands of a new age are the only ways of protecting our children's bodies. It is these capacities of the mind which desperately need fostering and which cannot be fostered by building bomb shelters.

Only by achieving quality education for all our children—only by providing adequate classroom space, reduced class size, and fully qualified teachers—can we realistically meet the nuclear challenge. Those who hope to depend on bomb shelters are dreaming in the past.

Baltimore must choose. Shall we direct our efforts toward illusory civil defense or civic intelligence?

Sincerely yours,

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL,
BALTIMORE TEACHERS UNION,
MILTON GOLDBERG, President.

Responsible Men Must Set Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I share the hope of the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier that an increase in the price of steel can be avoided, but as the Courier properly points out, this determination should not be made in Washington.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues, the following Courier editorial, entitled "Responsible Men Must Set Prices":

President Kennedy has every right to use persuasion in an attempt to prevail upon American steel companies to refrain from price increases this fall. Since steel is such a basic commodity in all manufactured prices, it is more important to maintain price stability in steel than in any other raw material.

But the President has no right to use threats or intimidation in attempting to prevent such price increases. He has been given no authority in law to fix prices. An attempt to use the threat of antitrust action and other governmental procedures to accomplish indirectly what he has no legal authority to accomplish directly would violate his oath of office.

So far, the President has not resorted to direct threats; and he is to be commended for that. But the President has been inconsistent in publicly asking for no price increases in steel while making no similar pleas for no wage increases. He says only that the public interest would be served by a future steel wage settlement "within the limits of advances in productivity and price stability."

Thus the President ignores the fact that steelworkers will automatically get a wage increase of 13 cents an hour on October 1 by the settlement reached, under Government pressure, at the conclusion of the long 1959 strike.

The public obviously will hope that the steel companies can avoid a price increase. But it also realizes that Government price fixing means Government wage fixing and that those things mean the end of a flexible, free enterprise economy. The President cites economic studies which indicate that the companies could continue to make a good profit without a price increase. But if U.S. economists are to be the final authority

on prices, then once again we have substituted Government regulation for a free economy. We have such Government regulation in the railroad industry; and the effects of poor judgment by Government officials on the long-range development of the rail network are apparent on every side.

As long as true competition exists, the only final judge of the necessity for a price increase should be the men with the responsibility for running the business. We have adequate steel capacity today because the judgment of those men has been sound. If irresponsible Government regulation is substituted, shortages, poor technological progress, and, ultimately, tax subsidies to pay politically increased wages would result.

Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 31, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, September 17 to 23 is Constitution Week. We in the Congress can well pause to reaffirm our faith in the foundation of our Government.

Under unanimous consent, I include a statement on Constitution Week prepared for the Greenwood (Miss.) Commonwealth by Mrs. E. C. Buchanan, in behalf of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Mrs. Buchanan is one of the leaders in that organization in Mississippi, as well as in many other worthwhile civic enterprises.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

(Submitted by Mrs. E. C. Buchanan)

The week of September 17-23 will be honored throughout this country as Constitution Week, celebrating the birth of a concept never before adopted by any people as their governmental philosophy. The framers of the Constitution believed that all powers of sovereignty should forever reside in the people and that the government they were about to establish should be a limited government subject always to the will of the people.

Men pause in contemplation of the meeting of minds that took place in Philadelphia when the 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention met there in 1784. That so large a group of men of integrity and consequence, from 13 States, could subordinate their individual preferences and make mutual concessions, revise, and at last present, this Constitution—our guide for nearly a century and three-quarters—is a remarkable achievement. It was their earnest desire to bequeath to their, and our, beloved country, including all its people, a document that would make and keep us forever free.

But now, with luxuries available undreamed of by the Plymouth pioneers and thinking more of our personal affairs than they did, we find that our Constitution has been chipped away, bypassed, and sometimes ignored. However, the heart of it is still there. May we feel in our hearts a burning desire to preserve, restore, and renew it for ourselves and for those who come after us, knowing that "we are not here to stay." Let there be no delay in our endeavors to have government in accordance with the Constitution as written in 1787 and its later amendments. The standards set up then are still sufficient for all present conditions.

From both the hearts and minds of the men and women of America should come

thankfulness and praise to the delegates to the Constitutional Convention: To Madison, the father of the Constitution; to Franklin, "perhaps the greatest American then living"; to Hamilton, master of finance; to Washington, the Father of his Country; for a document of such far-reaching power and protection. The balance of power between departments of government, never more needed than in these strenuous years of anxiety and worldwide insecurity, was provided for with vision and precision to meet the needs of troubled days such as these, as well as those of the young Republic.

A failure on our part to uphold our price-less legacy, the Constitution, not alone in our hearts, but by word and deed, may cause it to become altered or snatched from us, possibly by indirect means.

May we, the heirs of these enlightened framers of the Constitution, be on guard to prevent the rapid centralization of power in our Government which is the last step preceding national decay. Let us rededicate ourselves anew to an adherence to the principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence, in the Federal Constitution, and an abiding faith in God.

Time To Consider Carefully Our Participation in United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the U.S. News & World Report shows clearly that the United States and the Western World does not control the balance of power in the United Nations. After reading the reports of the so-called neutralist conference in Belgrade which was predominantly pro-Communist in its thinking, and realizing that many of these same nations make up the bloc which does have a majority of the votes in the U.N., maybe it is time the United States re-evaluates our participation in that Organization:

IS UNITED STATES LOSING OUT IN THE UNITED NATIONS?

(To Khrushchev, a meeting of the United Nations is a chance to denounce the United States. Suddenly, President Kennedy has ordered a counterattack.

(This U.N. Assembly is to be the scene of a U.S. challenge to Russia. It's a bold bid for leadership in a spot where the United States looks weak.)

NEW YORK CITY.—Once again delegates of the world's many nations are gathering here for a session of the U.N. Assembly.

This time the world is on notice from U.S. President Kennedy that a major battle of the cold war is to be fought out on the Assembly floor.

The Kennedy challenge to Khrushchev comes at a time and in a place which, at first glance, appear to many experts to be unfavorable to the United States.

The United States, as the leader of the non-Communist world, at one time dominated the Assembly. This is no longer true.

Instead, under the Assembly rule of "one nation, one vote," the United States and its allies have slipped into a minority position. It is the small nations, the "new nations"

just emerging from tribal societies, which now are the majority bloc in the Assembly.

At the very time when the United States appears to be losing out in the U.N., however, fast-moving events of September headed toward a showdown between the U.S. President and the Soviet dictator.

Khrushchev, as the month began, touched off a series of atmospheric nuclear tests, still underway with a 10th explosion on September 14. Not until September 15 did the United States begin underground tests, which produce no fallout. Through the month, Khrushchev carried on a war of nerves against the United States in Berlin.

What Khrushchev wants, as diplomats here in New York see it, is evidence of Western capitulation to his threats. He wants this evidence before he reports to his Communist Party Congress in Moscow in mid-October.

WHERE KENNEDY STANDS

Now Mr. Kennedy, seizing the initiative, has focused attention on the U.N. Assembly. On September 13, talking to two leaders of "neutral" countries who were in Washington to urge peace, Mr. Kennedy made these points:

A summit meeting with Khrushchev is not likely before October. In November, perhaps. But not now.

Talks can be started, if Khrushchev wants them, at lower levels. Andrei Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister, can talk with Dean Rusk at the Assembly session this month.

A U.S. drive to seize the initiative from Khrushchev will be staged at the Assembly meeting. Mr. Kennedy himself will keep close contact with the U.S. delegation, directing U.S. strategy.

War, big or little, is not wanted by the United States. But the United States does not intend to retreat before Khrushchev's threats over Berlin or his nuclear-bomb blasts in Russia.

Within 24 hours after the President spoke in these terms to President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Keita of Mali in Washington, Khrushchev moved to accept the Kennedy initiative. Gromyko got orders from Moscow to meet with Mr. Rusk in New York.

SHIFTING OF BALANCE

Question now raised is this: What sort of forum, what sort of court, has the United States chosen for this challenge to Khrushchev? What will be the result?

Here in the United Nations headquarters a check of the roll of the 99 members of the Assembly shows clearly that the voting power in this U.N. body no longer rests with the United States, nor yet with Russia.

The 50 smallest and least-powerful nations of the U.N. could, if they chose to vote as a bloc, control the Assembly. And a major factor in the decisions emerging from this Assembly will be the votes of the so-called "new nations" of Africa and of Asia.

Some of these new nations have a total population less than that of many U.S. cities. Few of them have anything approaching the wealth of any State of the United States.

More and more new nations have been created, as European allies of the United States have set free their colonies. Each new nation sought membership in the United Nations. Most were welcomed into the U.N. by the Soviet Union, eager to cut down the U.S. voting power.

Strange names appeared on the list of U.N. members—Central African Republic, Chad, Dahomey, Gabon, Malagasy, Somalia, the Voltaic Republic. The Congo Republic is listed twice—once for a former French colony containing less than 1 million people, once for an area now in chaos and occupied by a U.N. army.

Each new nation has one vote, equal to that of every other member of the U.N. in the Assembly. Any two nations can outvote the United States. It takes four to outvote

Russia, which clings to two extra votes for Ukraine and Byelorussia, ruled as provinces of the Soviet Union.

It is to this Assembly, in which U.S. power in votes stands at a new low, that President Kennedy has decided to take the major problems of the nuclear age.

THE OUTLOOK NOW

Issue by issue, this is what the President expects to get from the Assembly in New York:

Berlin: The Rusk-Gromyko talks here may lay the groundwork for Kennedy-Khrushchev talks later. Assembly action may be limited to a resolution saying, in effect: "Why don't you two leave things as they are in Berlin until you can talk up a settlement?" That would suit Mr. Kennedy. It is Khrushchev who wants to make changes in Berlin.

Germany: Many members of the U.N. Assembly would like to see the Western Powers forget the agreement on a united Germany and face the fact of a divided Germany. That is one thing Khrushchev wants. But no Assembly resolution on this point is in sight.

Disarmament: The United States will hammer hard at the evidence of Soviet bad faith on nuclear disarmament. For weeks, at Geneva, Khrushchev's men stalled the talks on a test ban while Russia prepared for tests. Khrushchev was still testing when, on September 15, Mr. Kennedy announced that the United States had a plan for "complete and general disarmament" ready to present to the Assembly.

Colonialism: Portugal, France, the Netherlands, too, all allies of the United States may come in for an Assembly scolding over Portuguese Angola, French troubles in Algeria and Tunisia, Dutch possession of Western New Guinea. U.S. plans, however, call for emphasis on the decline of Western colonialism as Russia builds up her Communist colonies in East Europe, seeks Communist power in Africa.

China: United States, at this Assembly, faces the risk of a debate over whether Red Chinese or Nationalist Chinese of Formosa should sit in China's seat in the U.N. Assembly. If it comes to a vote there is a chance that Red Chinese would be seated over U.S. objections. U.S. officials here say only that they "hope" to hold the line against seating Red China.

Many other issues are certain to rise before this Assembly runs its course. That may take many weeks, even months. Each chief delegate of the 99 member nations has the right to speak on any subject in the general debate opening the sessions. By mid-September a total of 60 speakers were registered at the U.N. for this general debate alone. Debates on specific issues will open new floodgates of words.

RED TARGET—HAMMARSKJOLD

There is one issue threatening under all others now before the Assembly. This is the Soviet effort to oust the present Secretary General of the U.N., Dag Hammarskjold, and to undermine the powers of his office. On this issue U.S. officials confidently expect to win a major victory.

Khrushchev, banging his shoe on an Assembly desk top last year, launched the attack on Hammarskjold. Since then Russia has demanded not only Hammarskjold's resignation, but also has asked that his powers be split among three U.N. officials—a Communist, a Westerner, and a neutral.

This Soviet proposal, so far, has made little headway. Neutrals and new-nation leaders are well aware that it was a U.N. army under Hammarskjold's direction which frustrated the Communist plot to take over the Congo in 1960. As a result, there has been a growing opposition among small nations to the Khrushchev plan for weakening the powers of the Secretary General.

A major effort of the U.S. delegation at this Assembly will be concentrated on strengthening the U.N.'s powers to act in a Congo-type emergency.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION

Thwarted, so far, in his effort to grab the control of the United Nations through a three-man directorate, Khrushchev has worked at infiltrating the U.N. staff with Communist appointees. In this field the Soviet leader has had some success.

Under Soviet pressure, for example, Hammarskjold has been forced to downgrade his closest adviser, Andrew Cordier, just because Cordier is an American. In addition, two Russians have been given high-ranking U.N. staff jobs. And the U.N. personnel chief has had to recommend that Communists be given 110 of the 188 professional jobs to be opened this year and next.

Khrushchev's Communists have always scoffed at the idea of an international civil service. They force the U.N. to take men flamed by Russia and other Communist governments. Few Russians are qualified for the jobs they demand and get. Few stay on the job more than a year or so. Sometimes, without even notice to Hammarskjold, one Russian will take another's place on the U.N. staff.

Up to now Hammarskjold has kept Communist employees out of sensitive jobs, out of high staff councils. But an increasing number of U.N. staff members, as a result, must be written off as less than useless to the U.N.

A BATTLE ON THE FLOOR

In the showdown now taking shape in the U.N. Assembly, however, Communist staff members can play little part. U.S. strategy, as now planned, calls for a U.S. campaign against Khrushchev which will be played in the open, on the floor of the Assembly itself.

Kennedy aids here agree that it is difficult to predict how the new-nation delegates will vote in the Assembly contest now beginning. But U.N. membership rates high among the new nations, so high that some small countries hard up for cash have no permanent diplomatic staff abroad beyond their U.N. delegations. As a result, U.S. officials say, U.S. defense of the United Nations is bound to win friends and supporters among the new-nation leaders.

One U.S. official, speaking privately, said this of the President's gamble on the U.N. Assembly:

"What can we lose by tossing all these problems into the Assembly's lap? At worse a few resolutions may go against us. At best we may recapture the initiative from Khrushchev, may stiffen a few neutral spines to stand up against Khrushchev. Above all we can show that we aren't afraid of Khrushchev. And that's worth a few resolutions."

The United States, losing out in U.N. votes, now is seeking to recapture U.N. leadership. That is the "new strategy" of the United States in the United Nations.

The Late Honorable Overton Brooks

SPEECH

OF

HON. ARTHUR WINSTEAD

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened by the news of the untimely death of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS of Louisiana. His passing is in-

deed a distinct loss to this Chamber and to our entire Nation.

Prior to his appointment as chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I was privileged to serve with OVERTON BROOKS for many years on the House Armed Services Committee. I also served under his chairmanship on a subcommittee which was concerned with legislation affecting our National Guard and Reserve Forces. So great was his contribution in this area of our defense program that he was often referred to as "Mr. Reserve."

OVERTON BROOKS was a dedicated American and was untiring in his efforts in behalf of his district, State, and Nation. I join my colleagues in expressing deep and heartfelt sympathy to his wife and daughter and to other members of his family. May it bring some measure of comfort to reflect on his worthwhile life and to know that countless friends throughout the Nation share their great sorrow.

What Does Federal Aid Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Winnebago (Minn.) Enterprise points up the proposition that there is in reality no such thing as free Federal aid. The editor, Stanley Olson, comments that the Federal Government actually has no money of its own to give and goes on to state:

Whatever money it gives away or spends it first takes away from our earnings in taxes. It is mortgaging the earnings of our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren.

This is the aspect of deficit spending which former President Eisenhower said is, in his opinion, not only improper but downright immoral.

I include the editorial from the September 14, 1961, Winnebago Enterprise in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

NO FEDERAL AID

The term "Federal aid" should be deleted from the American vocabulary and the words "taxpayers' aid" substituted. There is no such thing as "Federal aid," for in truth it is taxpayers' aid. Our Federal Government has no money of its own. Whatever money it gives away or spends it first takes away from our earnings in taxes. It is mortgaging the earnings of our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren.

It seems that we are obsessed with the Federal aid idea. We can't seem to realize that whatever the Federal Government gives in aid to education, to the aged, to the unemployed, to Laos, to the Congo, to farmers, or to business, is our money, personally earned by us.

This Nation of free people is truly at the crossroads. Down one road lies complete dependency on Government. We can turn over to the Federal Government the care of our old folks, the building of our schools,

and the education of our children. We can hand over to Government every one of the individual responsibilities which freemen have always been glad to carry themselves. There are enough people in Washington who will be glad to take care of all these items for us—they believe they can do it better than we can. But let there be no mistaking where this road leads—it leads to total dependency and there is no government on earth which can supply the standard of living which America has achieved through individual effort. If we continue to go down this road, we must give up our freedom. We must give up our self-respect and our integrity. We will end up paying everything we make to Government, and then the Government will return to us just enough to keep body and soul together.

Down the other road there is freedom. The entrenched bureaucrats are not going to give up the hold they already have over your money very willingly. It will take a real struggle to regain the right to take care of our own responsibilities, and the victory can only be won if we are willing to do for ourselves what free people must do in order to remain free. If we are willing to assume the responsibility for ourselves and for the needs of our own communities, counties, and States, if we are willing to insist that our local officials do their duty instead of turning it over to Washington, and if we have the courage to wage a real battle to regain the control of our own money, America will remain free. It can be done, but we are the ones who must do it.

Kennedy Pleased by Record of 33 Major Bills Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Cecil Holland, staff writer of the Washington (D.C.) Star which appeared in a recent issue:

KENNEDY PLEASED BY RECORD OF 33 MAJOR BILLS PASSED

(By Cecil Holland)

With Congress getting ready to go home, President Kennedy is looking back on his administration's record in the first session of the 87th Congress with a high measure of satisfaction.

The President feels that the record is about as fine as it could be, and in some respects even better than he had expected.

Thirty-three measures regarded by Mr. Kennedy as important, covering both domestic and foreign affairs, have been enacted by a Congress many thought would be slow to go along with the proposals of the new President.

As viewed by the President and his close advisors, the record is the best of any new administration in 30 years.

To support this view, they say that in contrast to the 33 "important" measures requested by Mr. Kennedy and approved by Congress this year, the 73d Congress in 1933 approved only 11 major bills, all dealing with the domestic economy, for President Roosevelt.

And they say that President Eisenhower in 1953, his first year in office, had only 12 major bills enacted, including extension of

the reciprocal trade agreements, foreign aid, a major tax revision and refugee legislation.

Another analysis of President Eisenhower's first year in office, by the independent Washington research service, Congressional Quarterly, credits him with having achieved 32 of his requests of Congress.

MANSFIELD, DIRKSEN DIFFER

Senate Democratic Leader MANSFIELD, of Montana, said yesterday he thought Congress has written a very satisfactory record in this session, but Senate Republican Leader DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said in a separate interview Congress has handed some serious defeats to President Kennedy, the Associated Press reported.

Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey put the administration's record at 32 measures and said this compared with 11 in the first Roosevelt year and 5 in General Eisenhower's first year. It adds up, Mr. Bailey said, to the greatest volume of vital business written into law in modern U.S. history.

While conceding that not all of his requests have been approved this year, Kennedy advisers say the President has suffered only one major legislative defeat—the proposal for a general aid-to-education bill which Mr. Kennedy has described as probably the most important recommendation he has made on the domestic front.

The administration does not consider the failure of Congress to enact any tax or medical care for the aged legislation as a defeat, since Mr. Kennedy is said to have decided not to press for action in these areas until next year.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS LISTED

The administration regards the following as its major legislative accomplishments in combating the recession:

Temporary extension of unemployment benefits; aid to dependent children of unemployed; area redevelopment providing for Federal assistance to industrial and rural areas with large unemployment; expansion of the Social Security Act, including provision for men to retire at 62 instead of 65.

The following nine measures are classed by the administration in the general category of getting this country moving again.

A comprehensive housing bill; a water pollution control act calling for a 5-year program with grants being doubled to benefit 5,000 communities; an increase in the minimum wage; authorization for an effort to reach the moon and other space explorations; a \$75 million, 6-year program for conversion of saline water; a community health facilities program regarded by the administration as the first part of its medical care for the aged package; an emergency feed grain program; an omnibus farm bill calling for expanded use of marketing orders, the school milk program and increased food for peace—estimated by the administration to save the taxpayers \$800 million—and authorization of the Cape Cod National Park as the first major addition to the national park system in 14 years.

FOREIGN BILLS ACTED ON

A foreign aid bill calling for 5-year commitments; establishment of the Peace Corps on a permanent basis (now in its final legislative stage); creation of a disarmament administration office in the State Department; adoption of the \$500 million alliance for progress program for economic and social work in the inter-American countries, and ratification in the Senate of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development are regarded by the administration as five major accomplishments in the field of foreign affairs.

A \$6 billion increase in defense expenditures, or 14 percent more than the late Eisenhower budget; authority to recall reservists and National Guard units to active duty, and a new start on civil defense, providing steps

for the first serious shelter program, are three major accomplishments the administration sees in the national security field.

Other actions regarded as important, if not major, include creation of the Office of International Travel in the Commerce Department in an effort to attract tourists here; reduction of customs exemptions from \$500 to \$100, and tax incentives to retain assets of foreign central banks—all designed to combat the balance of payments deficit and outflow of gold.

The creation of 73 new Federal judgeships, a package of three anti-crime bills and a measure to combat juvenile delinquency are regarded as important actions in the administration of justice.

The administration considers these six actions important in extending or amending existing programs. Revisions in the financing of the highway program; extension of corporate income tax and excise tax rates; extension of the debt-limit ceiling; an expanded Federal Aviation and Airport Act; extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, and reinstitution of the Reorganization Act. The administration remains hopeful of getting a postal rate increase through before Congress adjourns.

For one who recognizes the party role of a President, the results also have been pleasing to Mr. Kennedy. Except on such bipartisan matters as defense and to some extent on foreign aid, the President's program has been enacted against fairly heavy Republican opposition.

The President and his aides are not unduly disturbed by Republican charges of excessive spending. If it had not been for the cost of additional national defense steps and activities in the space program, and the effects of the recession, the administration contends, the budget would be more than balanced. With something approaching full employment the budget will be balanced and a surplus will prevail in the 1962 fiscal year, they believe.

**"The American Character," an Address
by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr at Meeting on
the American Character, Washington,
D.C., June 1, 1961**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distinguished citizens of the United States is the Reverend Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, an outstanding theologian and writer whose thinking on religion and on political and social problems has had a significant influence not only on many Americans but on intellectual and political leaders throughout the world.

It was my privilege on June 1, 1961, to be present at a dinner in Washington, D.C., which Dr. Niebuhr addressed on the subject of "The American Character."

The meeting, which was sponsored by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, was in honor of Justice Hugo L. Black of the Supreme Court.

I believe that Dr. Niebuhr's profound address on this occasion deserves to be brought to the attention of Members of

Congress and I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. REINHOLD NIEBUHR AT A DINNER MEETING ON THE AMERICAN CHARACTER AT THE SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 1, 1961

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Justice Black, and ladies and gentlemen, apologies are boring and I am not going to spend time in apologizing for speaking even for half an hour on this tremendous subject of "The American Character," particularly to an audience that is made up of learned scholars and learned practitioners of the political art who, as it were, know American character in the raw. I can only say that we of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions have launched this project this week—our study of the American character—and I hope, though it is precarious and hazardous, that it will succeed and be creative and that my contribution this evening will be valid if it is related to the historical setting.

Let me begin by giving my definition of "character." I think that the character of individuals and of nations is a pattern of consistency that is woven by historical circumstances. The woof is the physical circumstances of life, and the warp comprises the cultural, spiritual, and moral endowments of individuals or of nations.

I think all judgments about character are bound to be speculative and challengeable though they can be partially validated by setting them in a historical context.

WOOF AND WARP OF THE NATION

As far as our great Nation is concerned, we can simply define the "woof and warp" of it. The "woof" is the fact that we were born on a virgin continent. (My English friends remind me that it really wasn't "virgin": there were Indians here, and after we prayed to God we preyed upon them.) Anyway we were on a partially virgin continent and had a tremendous hinterland and could occupy it without let or hindrance under the sanction of "manifest destiny." And the continent was endowed with great natural resources. This is the "woof" of our national character.

The "warp" of it is that we fancied, for obvious but in the light of history not very plausible reasons, that we had embarked on an entirely new beginning for mankind. The settlers of Massachusetts thought they had made a new beginning for a purified church; in Virginia settlers thought they had made a new beginning for a purified political community, because they assumed that if you got rid of the absolutism of monarchy, you got rid of "evil"—as the Communists now think if you get rid of capitalism, you get rid of "evil." There has been, therefore, a note of messianism in our national character from that day to this day. Think of how near hysterical we have been recently about the national purpose, whether we have a national purpose or what the national purpose is. (Obviously our national purpose is to do our duty within the limits of our capacities in the situation in which we find ourselves.)

So we are basically Messianists. The spiritual endowments we have and on which we pride ourselves, are also somewhat dubious, more dubious than we like to admit. The Calvinists of Massachusetts said the proof of our virtue would be found in our prosperity—which was a questionable proposition, because in this great country we were bound to be prosperous, but prosperity would make for self-righteousness.

OUR CHARACTER IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

This was the original woof and warp of our historical destiny. I am going to speak briefly now of how this has worked out in history on various levels of life and in different realms of thought and action. I will be-

gin with the obvious—our character in the international community. All of our thoughts and responsibilities are now suffused with the idea that we are one of the two great imperial powers that control the world; we are engaged with the other imperial power in a tremendous wrestling match on the abyss of a possible nuclear catastrophe.

How did we get this way? It was only a quarter of a century ago that we were isolationists, and rather neurotic isolationists at that. A persistent theme running through our national life was the idea of designing European devils trying to outrage our American innocence and to draw us into the competitions of Europe. For instance, we were—in our own view—seduced into the First World War. But then we emerged out of the Second World War the most powerful democratic nation on earth. I think we have to admit now that we are the leader of the free world not purely by our virtue, but by our power, by controlling—as the Russians control—a vast continental economy.

It is an interesting thing that our isolationism was partly selfish. It wasn't quite what the psychiatrists call a "return to the womb" that we sought—it was merely a grasping after the cradle of our continental security. After technology had overwhelmed this continental security, the original desire for our primitive innocence remained. We had a dark suspicion that power meant responsibility and responsibility meant guilt—the guilt that we are involved in by the evil that we do in order to do good. We are never quite willing to accept that there is evil in our good—that's what makes us rather vexatious partners to our allies.

But we have done fairly well, and now we are in this imperial position, knowing full well that our power spells responsibility, and that exercising that responsibility means that our actions are all mixed with guilt.

POWER: TEMPTATIONS AND FRUSTRATIONS

There are some remaining problems for us. There is, for instance, the problem that we think our own history should point the way to the world how to get out of the nuclear dilemma. Weren't we one of the two nations (with Israel of old) that were formed by a contract? Can't we form a world community by a similar contract? Can't we get rid of all this terrible conflict and competition between two communities by a contract? By a world constitutional convention? I know that I am stepping on the tender toes of some of my intimate colleagues in this vicinity when I say that this is an evasion. I don't see how it is possible to establish a supersovereignty by a pure contract and subordinate the prestige and the power of these two great imperial nations, the United States and U.S.S.R., not to speak of De Gaulle's France.

Another great temptation that we have faced with relative success, is that it is very difficult for us, who believe we are masters of our fate and destiny, to be so frustrated in the day of our great power. Can't we use our power to cut through all these frustrations? But that might entail bringing history to a tragic end by bringing it to a neat conclusion.

Now I don't think I can solve the nuclear dilemma, but I would like to observe that we all hope some kind of disarmament agreement will gradually come—some solution will emerge out of these tortuous negotiations. I assume of course that there is a possibility of some kind of uneasy partnership between these two imperial nations despite the fact that one of them is governed by a very dogmatic utopian and messianic creed.

In regard to adjusting ourselves to an industrial civilization, let me be equally modest and say that I think we ought to realize that not only we but all the West-

ern European democracies had the great problem in the late 19th century of adjusting the individualistic idealism of the 18th and early 19th century to the social facts of an industrial civilization, which is bound to be collective. Here we succeeded as did the West European nations and the British Commonwealth. All of us, therefore, made ourselves immune to the Communist rebellion against democracy.

We succeeded, first, because we had proved on the one hand that there was a real force in equal political power guaranteed by the right of suffrage. And secondly, we established justice by raising up a countervailing power—the strong labor union—against the power of the corporation, which had centralized power by its innate capacities. So we have two quasi-sovereignties today, the “big union” and the “big corporation.”

LEGACY OF THE FRONTIER

There is no way to establish a tolerable justice without an equilibrium of power. That is what we have learned and learned it rather tardily. But why were we so tardy? Because, among other reasons, we were a wealthy nation and our social mobility made class resentment less pervasive. The class resentment that for good reasons was the instrument of social change in Europe evaporated among us. And then there was the frontier. You could always solve the vexatious problem of collective justice, or at least put it off, by heeding Horace Greeley's advice: “Young man, go West.” So we had the frontier. The frontier established the kind of liberty and equality without revolution that eluded the most radical revolution—the democratic revolution of Europe. But this put a note of sentimentality into all our politics. I don't think there is a question about it, a note of sentimentality. We think all these things are easier than they are: we do not recognize fully the recalcitrance of human nature against the norms and ideals of human history and destiny.

Let me move on to another great question about our national character—racial justice. You remember the distinguished Swedish social scientist Gunnar Myrdal wrote on the American dilemma, how tragic that dilemma is. A dilemma throughout our history. For instance, while Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,” Negro slaves were working in his garden. It may be heretical to say anything critical of Thomas Jefferson, but I am going to repeat what John Quincy Adams said—he said that Thomas Jefferson himself wasn't rigorous enough in applying the Declaration of Independence to the conditions of Virginia. Anyway the Declaration of Independence didn't help our Negro friends very much nor were the 13th and 14th amendments of immediate help. Now we are engaged in the agonies of establishing the validity and the honesty of our democratic creed for our Negro fellow citizens.

This is a tortuous process. I must not speak too much about that in the presence of distinguished members of the Supreme Court, because what is involved in it, I think, is a fascinating relationship between the majesty of the law, and the recalcitrance of local mores. I have had some difference of attitudes about the great decision that your Court made, Mr. Justice Black, 7 years ago. Sometimes I thought it was morally the greatest thing; then I thought since it tended to polarize and make the bad people worse and the good people better, it wasn't politically prudent even though it might be morally wise. But now I realize that it was absolutely necessary, because the basic diffi-

culty is that the Negro is guilty of a crime against the rest of us; he diverges so obviously from the white man's God-like image of himself. You cannot get rid of that, either by moral suasion or by law but you have to do it both ways.

UNIVERSAL NORMS FORGOTTEN

And I am glad we are doing it both ways. I am sorry that in this respect the Protestant Church has been so tardy. I say the Protestant Church not the Catholic Church because the Protestant Church has proved itself in this case to be a kind of middle-class white conventicle that has forgotten the universal norms of the Christian faith. But we are making progress here too, so we can be moderately proud and moderately humble about our character as an interracial community.

Certainly, as Henry Steele Commager reminded us during our conference this week, our religious life is unique on account of our pluralism. We have every Protestant sect in America and here every sect becomes a church, and every church becomes a sect. Even the Catholic Church becomes a sect in America—that is, not in their esteem but in our esteem.

We have the largest and most creative Jewish religious minority group of any Western nation. I am particularly interested in this, because the relationship of Christians to Jews is one of the scandals of Western civilization as we all know. When I took the position 5 years ago—I took it 20 years ago but it was not publicized until 5 years ago—that Christians didn't have any business converting Jews, I had three kinds of reactions to my proposal. One was, “You are right, no matter what.” The second was, “You're right, but you are heretical.” And the third was, “You are wrong because you are heretical.”

There is a simple way of solving the third one by saying, “You must have a wrong definition of heresy.”

There was this great challenge, a Jewish minority. We haven't begun fully to fulfill our democratic and Christian moral creed in regard to the Jewish minority, particularly with reference to recognizing that the Jews—in my opinion—have a positive ability, not to say genius, for civic righteousness. I could elaborate on that much more but I'll leave it at that.

Another important challenge was the growth of a great disciplined church, the Roman Catholic Church, first by immigration, and then, may I say, perhaps by outbreeding us, they have become more numerous. So all of our defensive reactions as Protestants are engaged in the power of this great church. We had some experience in the last campaign which would indicate that this is not an academic question. The amount of “hate mail” I received from Protestant sectarians—on the whole from the fundamentalist sects—was shocking. They thought that if we elected Mr. Kennedy President, the Pope would run America. At that time I had a little “dialog” with the distinguished Jesuit theologian, Gustave Weigel, and I agreed that he was right in saying that the Catholic Church allows Catholic statesmen to speak for a consensus beyond anything the church might say, but I added what also must be observed, that frequently the Catholic statesman takes more freedom than the church finds convenient.

TRIUMPH OF TRANSITION

I think we non-Catholics ought to appreciate this church that from our standpoint may represent a bit of medieval vestigial remnant. We ought not condescend to it like that, because we ought to recognize that it has two great virtues which, on the whole, individualistic protestantism, or secularism, or what-have-you does not have. I am go-

ing to say this in appreciation of catholicism. I hope that Monsignor Lally after I have finished won't say, “God deliver us from our friends.” I appreciate the Catholic Church because it was able to do something that I think is quite marvelous and that is, to take a priestly monarchy which at one time in the Middle Ages thought it was going to be the supersovereignty over all the nations, and make it a general instrument of a universal religious community, the only really universal Christian community. Incidentally, I hope that this isn't a “liberal heresy”—but I don't think this can be done without the institution of monarchy. If that be “heresy,” make the most of it.

Now the Catholic Church has two great advantages, one is that it never questions the social substance of human existence, that we are not just individuals but individuals who are fulfilled in, and frustrated by, our communities. The Catholic Church has an abiding sense of “community.” Its conceptions of “justice” are too fixed for me; they do not care enough about or take enough cognizance of the historical contingencies. For instance, take the “population problem”—the church's prohibition of birth control. But why should I go into this, when I want to appreciate the fact that the Catholic Church supports a natural law that has some relevance to an industrial civilization? I think it is marvelous that a church which I once thought could not extricate itself unaided from a medieval society has done very well in adjusting itself to a modern industrial society—better than most of us. This is one of its great virtues.

It is also a citadel which has guarded by its dogmas, which are probably irrelevant to many modern secular or Protestant Americans, the integrity and responsible freedom of the individual against the hazards of a technical, technocratic culture and civilization. This is a tremendous achievement.

CITADEL FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

I don't say that the Catholic Church is the only one that does this. I think that every institution of learning, and every religious institution ought to do this, but one of the great problems of the American character is, How are we going to come to terms with the pressing problems of a technical society? We define “technique” simply as the mastery of nature, man's scientific mastery of nature, which leaves many questions of human existence out, particularly the question about the individual, and the question about the meaning of his existence. Here is the Catholic Church, which is a very nonindividualistic institution, nevertheless having this citadel for the individual. I think we ought to be grateful that in an open society, there could be this voice about individual destiny that transcends all our social destinies.

What about this strange and pathetic individual, who is so insignificant in the coherences and incoherences of nature and history and so significant to himself and to the people who love him? He is going to die as all the animals die. Though he thinks he ought not to die and hopes that he is not going to die, he would not know what to do with eternity if he had it—what are you going to do with the pathos and incongruity of this individual existence? And what are you going to do if he asks the question: “What is the meaning of my individual and my collective destiny anyway?”

Now, here I must confess another heresy. Being a liberal in politics I have been rather consistently antiliberal in culture because I think it is rather pathetic that this great liberal culture of ours, this Western culture of ours, should interpret the meaning of human existence in terms of two very dubious dogmas, the “perfectibility of man,”

and the "inevitability of progress" in a nuclear age. Certainly, there must be some voice that says "this isn't true," and for my part I am glad that we have an open society in which either the Christian standpoint, or the Catholic Christian standpoint is not annulled or silenced, and where the secular society with all its wonderful scientific disciplines can challenge the inevitable obscurantism of the religious community, which is always involved in obscurantism because it claims that its symbols or its historical facts are more than historical facts. This is, in other words, a problem we are not going to solve, but thank God we have a community in which every one of these answers is still heard. We haven't solved the problem of the meaning of our existence and it has become more unsolvable because we are in conflict, in competition, with a very technocratic society that defines the uniqueness of man by saying that he is a toolmaking animal. We are certainly a little more than that.

I must admit that my friend Sir Charles Snow is right and say we have a particular reason for being somewhat technocratic because all the poor nations of the world are trying to get our technocracy; we are legitimately technocratic, but we ought to have some apprehensions about the preoccupation of man with the tools of life.

THE LIBERAL HERITAGE

I must come to a conclusion. There are many other problems we could consider in the American character. I should say that any of our studies would have to analyze the American heritage in order to show what is perennially valid in this glorious liberal heritage of the 18th century Founding Fathers, and what must be adjusted to the facts of a collectivist society. There, I think it is worth observing that we don't necessarily turn from error—the error of utopianism, messianism, and liberalism and individualism—to the truth of our realism, but that we are turning back to a much richer truth that our Founding Fathers collectively had. You take the idealism of Jefferson, the sober realism of a Madison, and the wintry pessimism of John Adams, not to say the cynicism of an Alexander Hamilton, all have their place in the threshing floor of an open society where truth is separated from error and error from truth. Incidentally, in this open society, we have a place even for those systems which believe that the truth should be guaranteed by authority, religious or political, against error. This is also a great achievement of our free society.

We must look at the past not only because it shows us how finite we are, what creatures of our determinations, but because we are also responsible agents in history, and we must study the past to free ourselves for the future. Freedom is the knowledge of necessity, though not in the way that Hegel and Marx said it was. We must have the knowledge of our finite determinations of the past, in order that we may be free to master our destiny in the future. We must know the past, and then we must not be preoccupied with it.

I must close with a word from one of the greatest statesmen of our age, Sir Winston Churchill. In a memorable address he made in New York after the war, during the Berlin airlift, he said something like this about the past, and the future, and about man's determination of freedom. He said: "Our airlift has won us the hearts of the German people, gentlemen. I hope you won't be offended that I think it important to win the hearts of the German people seeing they did us so much wrong—but, gentlemen, let us only remember so much of the past as will make us creative in the future."

The Forgotten Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 15, 1961

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, September 14 is a historical date in the city of New Orleans. It is the anniversary of the day on which the carpetbaggers were driven from New Orleans and constitutional government restored in 1874.

Each year on this date the Board of Commissioners of Liberty Place—the name given to the spot on which the battle of September 14 was fought—assemble to pay homage and tribute to those patriots who fought and died there. Each year a prominent person is selected to deliver an address at the annual banquet. This year Associate Justice of the Louisiana Supreme Court Walter B. Hamlin made the principal address.

It has been my privilege to have known Justice Hamlin since childhood when we attend McDonough School No. 17 in New Orleans. He has become one of Louisiana's outstanding jurists. His address before the Board of Commissioners of Liberty Place was of such significance and importance that I thought it fitting and proper to bring it before this body.

The address and the subject matter speaks for itself. Here it is:

ADDRESS BY WALTER B. HAMLIN, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF LIBERTY PLACE, AT ANTOINE'S RESTAURANT, NEW ORLEANS, LA., SEPTEMBER 14, 1961

Mr. Toastmaster and gentlemen, I desire to thank you for the opportunity to address you tonight. However, before going further in my address, I believe it is of value to this discussion to call to your attention to the fact that, by a curious coincidence, each time a constitution of Louisiana was adopted has been just before, during, or shortly after wars in which our Nation participated.

In 1812 Congress passed an act authorizing a constitutional convention in the Territory of Orleans preparatory to Louisiana's being admitted as a State. The Mexican War took place about 1845. Our next constitution was that of 1845. The convention met in Jackson, La., and adjourned to New Orleans.

The next constitution was adopted in 1852, while the clouds of the War Between the States were gathering. In 1860 a State convention met in New Orleans and passed an Ordinance of Secession. In 1861 this same convention amended the Constitution of 1852 by inserting the words, "Confederate States" in place of "United States," with a few other changes which were unimportant.

The next constitution was adopted in 1864 during the War Between the States and while New Orleans was lying prostrate with the heel of Silver Spoon Ben Butler of Massachusetts on its neck. It may seem strange, but this constitution was submitted to the people. A small amount of people turned out, and it carried by a vote of 6,836 to 1,566.

The War Between the States ended in 1865. The carpetbagger and the scalawag took control over our State, ruling with an

iron hand, also with his heel on Louisiana's neck. These intellectuals were responsible for the Constitution of 1868, which they submitted to the people, and which carried by a somewhat larger vote—66,152 to 48,739.

Six years later, the engagement of September 14, 1874, took place, and the rule of the carpetbagger and scalawag was overthrown. However, it took 5 long years for the free citizens of Louisiana to be able to hold another Constitutional Convention, which was done in 1879. Since that year we have had Constitutional Conventions held in 1898, around the time of the Spanish-American War; 1913, shortly before World War I commenced, and 1921, about 2½ years after the armistice in November, 1918. The Constitution of 1921 is still in effect, but the foundation of its provisions is the Constitution of 1879.

This community is indeed fortunate in having this organization commemorate each year the anniversary of the battle of September 14, 1874.

This conflict took place because the people of this community were tired of a tyranny and an oppression which had deprived them of their rights as individuals, guaranteed to them by the ninth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as well as their other constitutional rights, and they were determined to put an end to this unspeakable situation. They knew that the Constitution and the Bill of Rights had unified the American people, and that they were entitled to the protection they offered.

I submit to you that this battle on September 14, 1874, which was fought to preserve the independence of the people of this community, was just as important as the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, which ended the War of 1812, as there is no doubt that the War of 1812 was the "Second War for American Independence." The affair we are assembled to commemorate may be called a skirmish when compared with other battles recorded in history's pages, but its importance and the bravery of its participants has set a fine example for all time to all men determined to be free.

In times like these it is well for our attention to be called to the fact that our Constitution and the Bill of Rights is a good answer to the violent, turbulent men, both at home and abroad, in their attempts to place might upon the pedestal that others have raised to right.

It is not feasible for me to dwell too much upon the provisions of the Bill of Rights, but I feel that a discussion of the ninth amendment to the Constitution, commonly known as the forgotten ninth amendment (and I refer you to an excellent work with this title by Mr. Bennett Patterson of the Texas bar) is in order upon this occasion. The ninth amendment is very short, and reads as follows: "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

The ninth amendment is a basic statement of the inherent natural rights of the individual, for which your ancestors fought in the vicinity of the monument on Canal Street. On its face this amendment states that there are certain unenumerated rights that are retained by the people as individuals.

These rights do not owe their origin to constitutions. They existed before constitutions were even thought of. They exist inherently in every man, by endowment of the Creator, and are merely reaffirmed in our Constitution. They are incapable of enumeration, but as they are infringed upon, the individual has the right to apply to the courts for relief and redress.

There are many who possess a richer experience than your humble servant. The

best I can do is to give examples of some—only some—of the unenumerated inherent rights contemplated by the Constitution, in order that this discussion may have practical purpose. The right to establish justice, promote general welfare, secure the blessings of liberty, protect our persons and property from violence, are examples of natural, inherent rights.

Violations of these rights are: No man should be compelled by another to do what the laws do not require; nor to refrain from the acts which the laws permit. A law that makes a man a judge in his own cause; or a law that takes property from A and gives it to B; a law that punishes a citizen for an act which when done was in violation of no existing law—these are examples.

The right "to be let alone" is one of our inherent rights which has been sustained by our courts; the right to privacy is inherent; the right to acquire and own property and to deal with it and use it as the owner chooses, so long as the use harms nobody, is a natural right.

The Declaration of Independence mentions rights to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle all men—among these being life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The Declaration of Independence was a forerunner of the ninth amendment, and when it used the words "nature's God" and "among these," it was careful not to attempt to enumerate those rights. It was careful to admit that liberties and human rights were not man-made and could not be enumerated by man.

Therefore, the door is wide open for the results of research, the proper construction of this amendment, and enumeration from time to time of the rights with which the Government, or anyone, has no power to interfere. Remember—in our own lifetime we have seen, from the stream of history, that human rights are the product of the growth of civilization. The telephone, electricity, automobile, airplane, radio and television, paved roads, transportation facilities, and industry generally being vastly improved, they carry with them inherent human rights.

I feel certain that you will agree with me that the framers of the Bill of Rights looked far into the future and anticipated this growth of civilization, which, to say the least, is not short of being miraculous.

As before stated, the preservation of these rights was involved on September 14, 1874. Those intrepid, militant souls who believed in liberty and were willing to fight for it, wanted to make our land the land of golden opportunity and the meeting place of the world's finest ideas and ideals. It has been made so.

Therefore, we of this generation must, and should, pause now and then to think back upon their bravery and love of community and home. We should also pause to consider, as they did, the fact that as horrible as war is, defeat, with its looting and killing, starvation and pestilence, is worse. I believe that it is time that we became aware that a nation which feeds itself and its rising generations on pacifism is also spooning out defeatism.

Why do I say this? Twice in my lifetime I have witnessed 1 man having the power to set over 400 million men fighting for their lives. And today we are living under threat of the exercise of similar power by a third man. (And it is said that man is a rational animal.)

Twice in my lifetime I have been shocked at the quick desecration of our wartime armies. The first time was after the armistice of 1918, and the second time was in 1946 and 1947, after a sparsely trained army of 400,000 was turned into a sharp, hard-fighting, brilliantly organized global weapon that numbered 8 million men by 1945. This

drying up of our wartime armies is bound to recall the agonizing bloodletting of American soldiers and sailors who had gone to war ill prepared.

I know of no better way to put it than by quoting the words of the late Gen. George C. Marshall: "We have tried since the birth of our Nation to promote our love of peace by a display of weakness. This course has failed us utterly."

We must remain a strong Nation. You descendants of those heroes of September 14, 1874, I know, will uphold their traditions, urge preparedness, freedom from fear and hysteria, and the maintenance of the rights of the individual which are protected by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

A Clear-Cut Policy, Not More Studies, Needed To Win the War Against the Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the only way we are going to defeat the Communist conspiracy is to have a clear-cut and understandable policy which will leave no doubt in the mind of Khrushchev that we are determined to win any war he starts. Month after month, we have been waiting for the President to come forth with such a policy, but instead we receive a constant stream of statements from the White House calling for more studies, additional advice, further consideration. The hour is late. Unless we enunciate a firm policy soon, we may find ourselves still studying the world situation when the Communists have already taken over. The latest study group from which the President seeks advice is discussed in the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

WHAT'S THIS PROVE?

Mr. Kennedy the other day appointed a four-man board to give him a few answers about why all the propaganda victories go to the Communists and what should be done to wage effective psychological and political warfare. This group is odd in a number of ways.

First, its membership is composed of men he can reach by practically stepping across the hall. His brother, Attorney General Bobby Kennedy, is a member. So is Gen. Maxwell Taylor, presidential military adviser, who is in the White House with Kennedy. So is U. Alexis Johnson, deputy Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and former Ambassador to Thailand. Completing the formation is Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, a puzzler. Maybe his function is to persuade Walter Reuther to lend a few United Auto Worker goons to contribute their talents to the cold war.

It is explained that the Communists' ability to repress world reaction unfavorable to them, and to dominate the news as they choose with spurious "spontaneous" demonstrations, led to the creation of the new board.

Administration officials, for instance, were appalled that many neutralist nations received the news apathetically when the Soviet Union resumed nuclear testing. They figured everybody would have screamed if

the United States had done it, and that the Communists would have picketed and stoned our embassies around the world.

Well, we have a few suggestions. The first of them is that the only cold war political and psychological victories that count are those scored directly against the Communists. What the nonaligned nations think of things is utterly irrelevant, as Khrushchev demonstrated when he resumed testing in a spirit of utter contempt for their opinion.

The second is that the necessity to create such a board ought to impress Mr. Kennedy with the fact that \$4 billion a year in foreign aid and \$130 million a year for the alleged propaganda of the U.S. Information Agency is simply money down the drain. If these ventures had the slightest efficacy in winning "world opinion" our way or alienating it from communism, there wouldn't be any need for all this second guessing.

But, as we say, world opinion is of no consequence anyway. Khrushchev doesn't hold his slave empire together by bonds of love, but by terror and force. He doesn't command the respectful silence and even the active support of so many uncommitted countries because he is courteous and considerate, but because he is ruthless and they are fearful of him. He bangs nuclear bombs in their ears and they keep their mouths shut. But if we don't cough up another poultice of foreign aid, somebody wrecks another USIA library or plasters the front of our embassy by throwing bottles of ink.

Strength and purpose are respected in this out-of-focus world. When Mr. Kennedy starts convincing people that he means business and won't let the United States be pushed around, there will be no need for boards of psychological warfare.

An Invasion of American Rights That Must No Longer Be Tolerated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 19, 1961, I entered into the RECORD a statement on the effects of the Arab League boycott of American business and citizens having dealings with Israel or who happen to be of the Jewish faith. The catalog of boycott actions there set forth was a long and unpleasant one. At that time I urged that this Government do something to end discrimination by these Arab governments against our citizens and our business community. As far as I know nothing further has been accomplished in this area, and I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following supplement to the July statement of the Institute of Human Relations:

INVASION OF AMERICAN RIGHTS—SUPPLEMENT INTRODUCTION

The American Jewish Committee recently published an analysis of the Arab League¹ boycott from the standpoint of its interference with the legitimate activities of Americans—their right to travel abroad without being subjected to indignity, and to serve equally with other citizens in U.S.

Footnotes at end of speech.

military establishments overseas; their freedom to engage in commercial relationships without discrimination on ground of religion. These rights and freedoms are traditionally held inviolate by our Government.

This supplemental document deals with still further aspects of the Arab League boycott which affect American citizens, Christians as well as Jews, who are engaged in business and the professions.

The boycott has interfered with the commercial pursuits of Americans and American companies in many foreign countries. It has subjected American foreign trade to arbitrary restraint. It has obstructed American shipping and visited abuse upon American seamen in defiance of international law. It has intruded upon the professional activities of Americans in the entertainment field.

RESTRICTIONS ON AMERICAN BUSINESS AND THE PROFESSIONS IMPOSED BY THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT

The Arab League has said in effect that American business and industrial enterprises may trade in Israel or with the Arab countries—not both.

Blacklisting of American companies

Approximately 500 American concerns received warnings during 1960, sent through the U.S. mails from boycott offices in Damascus and Kuwait. A typical example is the following communication, dated August 23, 1960, from the Arab League Secretariat in Damascus to a company in New York:

"1. Do you have branch factories in Israel? and did you undertake any exploration work for oil in Israel?

"2. Do you have assembly plants in Israel?

"3. Do you have, in Israel, general agencies or head offices for your Middle Eastern operations?

"4. Do/did you give the right of using your patents, trademarks, copyrights, etc., to Israeli companies?

"5. Do/did you subscribe in Israeli companies or factories?

"6. Do/did you render consultative services or technical experience to Israeli factories?

"7. Do you represent Israeli firms in your country?

"8. Do you have a branch of yours in Israel? In case you have, please define its position as to your company.

"It is essential to have this declaration duly legalized by your competent authorities and countersigned by any Arab consul in your country.

"Finally, we would like to draw your attention to the fact that this declaration should reach us within a period not to exceed November 31, 1960. If this period elapsed without receiving your reply, we shall regretfully be obliged to ban transactions with you and to blacklist your company in all of the Arab countries.

"Yours faithfully,

"Dr. ABDUL KARIM EL-A'IDI,

"Commissioner General for the Boycott of Israel."

By 1961, according to *Fortune* magazine, the number of American firms on the Arab blacklist had risen "from about 20 in 1957 to nearly 4 times that."

Many companies—including Emerson Radio, General Tire & Rubber, Dow Chemical, and Merritt-Chapman & Scott—have refused to yield to the boycott.⁴ Some feel that the Arab market, despite its overwhelming numerical strength, would not compensate for loss of Israeli business. Some have discovered that certain cynical Arab countries are not above dealing with recalcitrant companies whose products are in short supply in the Middle East. Some simply object on principle to threats and foreign dictation.

A case in point is a large company in the Midwest, which is building a \$2-million plant in Haifa, to be completed in 1962. An official of the company explains its decision to defy the Arab boycott:

"Our Board was immediately concerned with the threat of boycott of our products by the nations of the United Arab Republic. We did considerable business in these countries and had received threats of the boycott by letter from four of the countries of the Arab bloc. Remember also the population totals—65 million Arab people to 2 million in Israel.

"Despite this, [we] felt that basically most Americans are not in sympathy with the boycott. Our own reaction is one of great distaste.

"The whole philosophy of the Arab bloc—its threat of boycott against people doing business in Israel, its attitude toward the Suez, its general political thinking—is opposed by the Western bloc of nations."

The viewpoint of many companies is summed up by *Fortune*:

"The growing willingness of U.S. and European investors to ignore Arab threats is, of course, due in part to sympathy with the Israeli cause. However, this factor is of less importance than the Arabs would have the world believe. The fact is that Israel offers economic opportunities which make it worth while for many types of investors to ignore Arab threats. Israel's per capita GNP—\$1,050—is 13 times greater than Egypt's.) Indicative of the changed outlook is the attitude of R. A. Hutchinson, a vice president of Studebaker-Packard, which opened an assembly line in Haifa in 1960. Said Hutchinson, 'We deal with all the Arab states. But if they choose to stop their purchases following our agreement here, that's their affair, not ours.'

"Moreover, the capricious manner in which the boycott is applied invites defiance. It is not a crime under the blockade regulations simply to sell good to Israel, but it is considered illegal to invest in Israel, to set up offices there, or to enter licensing and technical agreements with Israeli firms. But some U.S. companies, such as Bulova Watch, which do nothing more than sell their products to Israel, have found themselves summarily placed on the blacklist.

"Faced with such arbitrariness, formerly hesitant investors have apparently decided that they might as well be hung for sheep as for lambs."

Blacklisting of American ships

The Arab League boycott applies as well to American-owned vessels temporarily chartered to Israeli companies, or, as happens more frequently, carrying materials or agricultural or industrial products from the United States destined in large or small part for Israeli ports. The number of ships thus blacklisted varies; as of now, it is estimated that about 35 American-flag vessels are affected, plus an equal number owned by American companies but registered in other countries.

The closing of Arab ports to ships sailing to or from Israel has also subjected American seamen to insult and hardship.

The crew of the freighter *Westport*, entering the port of Suez en route from Israel in the fall of 1959, was held aboard ship for 22 days in violation of international law. The seamen's papers were impounded by the police. The seamen were forbidden to communicate with anyone except through Egyptian officials.⁵

In the summer of 1960, when the *Isthmian* arrived at Aqaba, Jordan, crew members were quizzed as to their religious affiliation and two members were prohibited from taking shore leave because their surnames did not sound "Christian" to the Arabs.⁶

Outraged by "harassment and mistreatment of American seamen in Arab ports,"

the Seafarers International Union picketed the Egyptian ship *Cleopatra* when it arrived in New York in April 1960. The picket line was honored by the International Brotherhood of Longshoremen. Unable to unload its cargo, the ship was stranded in New York for 3 weeks. Efforts by the owners to have the Federal courts enjoin the picketing met with no success.

The demonstration at the dock provoked anxiety in Washington—not because of the grievances which occasioned it, but because it might cause embarrassment.⁷ In exchange for the union's agreement to end their public protest, the State Department finally promised to look into the situation "and, through appropriate diplomatic action with the foreign countries involved, to renew its efforts to assure freedom of the seas and to protect the interests of our shipping and seamen now being discriminated against by the Arab boycott and blacklisting policy."

On July 12, 1961, the president of the National Maritime Union, Joseph Curran, charged that "American seamen still are subjected to indignities and threats of physical violence."⁸ He asked President Kennedy to protest to the United Nations against "continued United Arab Republic violations of the principle of freedom of the seas." In a telegram to the President, Mr. Curran warned:

"In the absence of action by governments or by the United Nations to enforce the principle of freedom of the seas, the International Transport Workers Federation representing unions of seamen and other transport workers with a total membership of 6,500,000 in 71 countries will have to consider joint action through its own resources, including boycott."⁹

American shipowners were affronted for nearly 2 years, starting in the spring of 1958, by the Navy's acceptance of the so-called Haifa clause in contracts for tankers calling at Persian Gulf ports. In effect, the clause barred U.S. vessels engaged in business with Israel from carrying Navy oil cargoes.¹⁰ In February 1960, when public pressure led the Navy's Military Sea Transport Service to withdraw the clause from its shipping contracts, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, commented:

"I hope the public protests which greeted revelation of this now discontinued practice will serve as notice to other Government agencies. The American public does not believe a U.S. Government agency should knuckle under to any form of international blackmail."¹¹

Denial of entry to the Suez Canal

In closing the Suez Canal to ships of American registry engaging in trade with Israel or stopping at Israeli ports, the United Arab Republic is defying United Nations resolutions and established practice, and violating the convention respecting the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal signed at Constantinople, October 29, 1888, by Turkey and eight major world powers. Egypt was then under Turkey's rule; the United Arab Republic, as successor to the Turkish Government in that region, is bound by treaty obligations assumed with respect to the Suez Canal.

The very first article of the convention states:

"The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag.

"The canal shall never be subject to the exercise of the right of blockade."

The UAR contention that the convention does not apply under conditions of war was clearly anticipated by article XI:

"The measures taken in the cases provided for in articles IX and X [which deal with measures to be taken by the Egyptian Government to enforce the treaty, defend Egypt and maintain public order] of the present

⁴Footnotes at end of speech.

treaty shall not interfere with the free use of the canal."

The convention prohibits the erection of permanent fortifications or other impediments to navigation (arts. VIII and XI), and provides for continuation of the treaty beyond the duration of the Acts of Concession of the Universal Suez Canal Company—that is, even when the Government of Egypt should come into direct control of the canal (art. XIV).

On November 2, 1956, during the emergency special session to deal with the Sinal-Suez Canal crisis, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for a cease-fire in the Middle East and urging that "steps be taken to reopen the Suez Canal and restore secure freedom of navigation."¹⁴

The U.S. position was summed up by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in 1956:¹⁵

"It seemed to us from the beginning that any solution should take account of two basic facts. One is that an international waterway like the Suez Canal, which has always had an international status, cannot properly be made an instrumentality of any government's national policies so that equal passage may depend on that government's favor. That does not require Egypt to forgo the rights which are normal to it as the sovereign nation through whose territory this international waterway passes. It does mean that Egypt should not be in a position to exercise such arbitrary power, open or devious, over the operations of this international waterway that the nations dependent on the canal will in effect be living under an economic 'sword of Damocles.' That would be an intolerable state of affairs. It would be inconsistent with the United Nations Charter requirement that these situations must be dealt with in conformity with the principles of justice and international law."

On January 8, 1957, to help defray the cost of rehabilitating the Suez Canal, the United States advanced \$5 million to the United Nations. As of July 1961, approximately \$3 million had been refunded in three installments, leaving a net of \$2 million contributed by the United States. Thus, in submitting to the exclusion of American ships from the canal, our Government is allowing its citizens to be denied access to an international waterway maintained in part out of their own pockets.

The "Freedom of the Seas" amendment to the Mutual Security Act, introduced by Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and KENNETH KEATING, and adopted by both Houses of Congress on May 2, 1960, declares that "such procedures as boycotts, blockades and the restriction of the use of international waterways" are disapproved by the United States and endanger the peace of the world; the amendment calls on the President to "report on measures taken by the Administration" to insure the application of these principles in granting foreign aid.¹⁶ But the State Department has not acted on this policy statement by the Congress.

Blacklisting of Hollywood and Broadway stars

Numerous American stage and screen stars of all faiths who have performed, or intend to perform, in Israel, or are said to harbor favorable feelings for that country, have been blacklisted by the Arab League. This extension of discrimination to the entertainment industry may well be intended to accomplish something more than appears on the surface—namely, to restrict freedom of expression.

The most publicized instance occurred in March 1961, when the United Arab Republic refused to permit a company of the American Theatre Guild, touring under the spon-

sorship of the U.S. Department of State and headed by no less renowned an actress than Helen Hayes, to perform in Cairo. The reason given was that the company was scheduled also to appear in Tel Aviv. Yet, no military or economic gain would accrue to Israel because of this visit. The cancellation seemed clearly to imply that if well-known persons could be disadvantaged because of their alleged friendly attitudes toward Israel or willingness to appear there, persons of lesser repute might be well advised not to evidence attitudes or make commitments displeasing to the Arab League.

TO UPHOLD THE INTERESTS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

Our State Department has repeatedly proclaimed its determination to protect basic American interests which are endangered by the Arab boycott. It has clearly catalogued those interests and its intentions with respect to them as follows:

"The U.S. Government protests as a matter of policy discriminatory actions or practices with respect to international trade which adversely affect U.S. firms, vessels, and citizens. The Department will continue to pursue, by all appropriate and effective means, every avenue whereby private American interests in international trade may be fully safeguarded, and restored."

"As a matter of settled policy, the United States supports the principle of freedom of the seas and free access to foreign ports and facilities. The Department has constantly sought to facilitate the normal pursuit of international commerce by vessels of U.S. registry."

"The U.S. Government has long and unequivocally maintained the principle that there should be freedom of transit through the Suez Canal for all nations. This policy has been publicly emphasized on numerous occasions, and was specifically reiterated by the Secretary of State during his address before the United Nations General Assembly on September 17, 1959."

"The Department of State reemphasizes that our Government neither recognizes nor condones the Arab boycott, which includes the blacklisting of U.S.-flag vessels in part because of prior calls at Israeli ports. Every appropriate opportunity will be utilized, on a continuing basis, to reemphasize this fundamental position to the governments concerned."¹⁷

But these and other assurances of devotion to principle still remain to be implemented by "effective means"; our Government has yet to move from praiseworthy assertions to appropriate action.

CITIZEN ACTION

The conscientious citizen, who may well ask "What can I do about this?" may find guidance in the State Department's declaration that the Department "gives full consideration to all communications from private American groups with respect to problems affecting the conduct of U.S. foreign relations."¹⁸ In view of this hospitality to the views of private citizen groups, leaders of such groups have the opportunity to address themselves to those aspects of the boycott which are of particular concern to their members:

Business, industrial, and trade organizations can urge that Government departments and agencies, and U.S. representatives abroad, henceforth refuse to cooperate with, or facilitate, those activities of Arab League nations which interfere with freedom of action on the part of American companies in establishing, maintaining, and extending commercial relations abroad. Business and industrial firms can themselves reject threats of boycott or blacklisting.

Labor unions, which have a substantial stake in frustrating the boycott, can continue to express the views already voiced by

several spokesmen of the labor movement, emphasizing the need for immediate action to uphold the principles enunciated by the State Department in its official statement of May 6, 1960, to the president of the AFL-CIO.

Religious, patriotic, and civic organizations can articulate their opposition to our Government's seeming toleration of Arab League activities which infringe upon American sovereignty and invade the rights of American citizens.

The mass media can interpret to newspaper and magazine readers, and radio and television audiences, the nature and significance of the Arab boycott, exposing it in its full light as an arrogant effort to dictate to the American business and industrial community under what conditions and with whom commerce and trade may be conducted in foreign countries.

Veterans' organizations can demand that the Armed Forces terminate their accommodation to Arab discrimination against American servicemen and henceforth refuse to make religious distinctions in the assignment of military and civilian personnel to U.S. establishments anywhere in the world.

All citizen groups can urge that Congress reexamine its foreign aid policy, with particular reference to expenditures for grants and loans to those Arab League nations which discriminate among American citizens and boycott American business and industry. All groups can call upon our Government to suit its action to its word, to insist that:

Citizens carrying American passports must receive equal hospitality wherever they may travel;

Ships flying the Stars and Stripes must enjoy freedom of navigation in whatever international waterway they may choose to sail;

Armed Forces personnel, whether military or civilian, must be assigned to overseas service, wherever such service is required, without regard for discriminatory religious criteria invoked by foreign governments in defiance of American law;

American citizens and American-owned companies must be free to pursue their legitimate commercial and industrial interests anywhere in the world without arbitrary interference and restraint;

Countries seeking to maintain friendly relations with the United States must be guided by these requirements.

In short, public opinion can call a halt to departures from principle in America's foreign relations. Public opinion can demand that our foreign policy be extricated from the quicksands of concession to bluster and affront, and restored to the solid rock of self-respect.

Allies are not won nor admiration stirred for our country by willingness to compromise national ideals on the grounds of expediency. The fallacy, indeed the cataclysmic consequence, of such a course has been borne out all too often in the downfall of once-proud nations.

Today, as in the past, America's true course lies in unyielding commitment to the principles that give us strength as a nation and stature as a leader among nations.

¹ The Arab League consists of 11 countries: Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, and Yemen.

² "Comments on Points Raised in New York State Resolution 131," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 3, 1961, p. 6568.

³ "The Frayed Arab Noose," Fortune, July 1961, p. 102.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., p. 106.

⁶ Seafarers Log, official organ of the Sea-

farers International Union, Atlantic and Gulf District, AFL-CIO, April 22, 1960.

⁷ Ibid., Aug. 19, 1960.

⁸ The New York Times, Apr. 24, 1960.

⁹ Statement by Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon to AFL-CIO President George Meany, May 6, 1960.

¹⁰ The New York Times, July 13, 1961.

¹¹ New York Herald Tribune, July 13, 1961.

¹² The Haifa clause: "In event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer shall have the option: "1. To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port,

"2. To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, condition of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position,

"3. To nominate other loading or discharging port or ports.

"Expenses incurred by the charterer in exercising an option shall be for the account of the owner."

¹³ The New York Times, Feb. 19, 1960.

¹⁴ United Nations Review, December 1956, p. 103.

¹⁵ "The Task of Waging Peace," address before the Dallas Council on World Affairs, Dallas, Tex. The Department of State Bulletin, November 5, 1956, p. 699.

¹⁶ Mutual Security Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-472; 74 Stat. 134), sec. 2, which amends sec. 2(f) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

¹⁷ Statement of Acting Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, op cit.

¹⁸ Ibid.

The Truth About the American Civil Liberties Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, many people have become very concerned about the connections of certain persons involved in the affairs of the American Civil Liberties Union with Communist front groups. They are asking the question: Does the ACLU really promote adherence to rights guaranteed the individual by the Constitution?

Organizational Research Associates, the address of which is Post Office Box 51, Garden Grove, Calif., has prepared a pamphlet entitled, "The Truth About the American Civil Liberties Union," which I believe should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress and to the American public. Under unanimous consent, I include the pamphlet in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

"Masters of Deceit," J. Edgar Hoover, page 228: "Fronts probably represent the party's most successful tactic in capturing non-Communist support. Like mass agitation and infiltration, fronts espouse the deceptive party line (hence the term 'front'), while actually advancing the real party line. In this way the party is able to influence thousands of non-Communists, collect large sums of money, and reach the minds, pens,

and tongues of many high-ranking and distinguished individuals. Moreover fronts are excellent fields for party recruitment."

Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, executive director of the International Christian Anticommunism Crusade, "Communist Legal Subversion," page 75, HCUA: "Any attempt to judge the influence of Communists by their numbers is like trying to determine the validity of the hull of a boat by relating the area of the holes to the area which is sound. One hole can sink the ship. Communism is the theory of the disciplined few controlling and directing the rest. One person in a sensitive position can control and manipulate thousands of others."

One quick way to evaluate the ideology of organizations is through consideration of the statements and claims of their leaders. So it seems necessary for a realistic appraisal of the civil rights policy of the American Civil Liberties Union that we develop the factual background of their prominent officials and leaders.

It has taken us months of painstaking research to prepare this pamphlet; it will take you only minutes to read it. So please read it and then pass it on and inform others of the information you are about to learn.

SECTION I

These are a few of the past and present prominent officials and leaders of the American Civil Liberties Union.

1. Roger Baldwin, founder and guiding light of the ACLU for over 30 years, is now a member of the National Committee of the ACLU. Mr. Roger Baldwin has a record of over 100 Communist-front affiliations and citations (documented in detail, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD May 26, 1952). In an article written for Soviet Russia Today (September 1934), Roger Baldwin said: "When the power of the working class is once achieved, as it has been only in the Soviet Union, I am for maintaining it by any means whatsoever." "The class struggle is the central conflict of the world, all others are coincidental."

Entry of Roger Baldwin in the Harvard reunion book on the occasion of the 30th anniversary reunion of his class of 1905 (1935), "I seek social ownership of property, the abolition of the propertied class, and sole control of those who produced the wealth; communism is the goal."

2. Dr. Harry Ward, first chairman of the ACLU. Dr. Harry Ward has a record of over 200 Communist front affiliations and citations listed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA). Dr. Harry Ward was chairman of one of the largest Communist fronts to flourish in this country, "The American League for Peace and Democracy," which was placed on the Attorney General of the United States list of subversive organizations on June 1, 1948. Dr. Ward is the author of "Soviet Democracy" and "Soviet Spirit," two pro-Communist books which clearly show Dr. Ward's love for the Soviet system of government. The California Senate Fact Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, in their 1948 report, page 246, said: "The Communist affiliation of Dr. Harry F. Ward is indicative of the Communist sympathies of the members and sponsors of the 'Friends of the Soviet Union.'"

3. Abraham L. Wirin, chief counsel for the Southern California Chapter of the ACLU, sometimes referred to as "Mr. ACLU."

In 1934 A. L. Wirin formed a law partnership with Leo Gallagher and Grover Johnson (reference: Daily Peoples World, Mar. 5, 1934, official publication of the Communist Party on the west coast). Mr. Leo Gallagher ran for State office on the Communist Party ticket in 1936 and Grover Johnson, when asked by a governmental investigating agency if he had ever been a member of the

Communist Party, refused to answer the question on the grounds that he might incriminate himself.

In 1954, A. L. Wirin was a candidate for the executive board of National Lawyers' Guild (reference: Los Angeles Daily Journal, Jan. 13, 1954). The National Lawyers Guild has been cited as a Communist front organization by the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HCUA) September 21, 1950. (Four years before, Mr. Wirin was a candidate for the executive board.)

4. Dr. Albert Eason Monroe, executive director of the Southern California Chapter of the ACLU:

In 1952, Dr. Albert Eason Monroe, U.S. Navy serial No. 316900, was discharged from the U.S. Navy Reserve under conditions other than honorable.

In 1950, Dr. Monroe was fired from his position as head of the English department of San Francisco State College for refusing to sign a loyalty oath. (The purpose of loyalty oaths is to protect the unsuspecting individual from lending his name to a Communist cause and from becoming a Communist dupe. The requirements of loyalty oaths have multiplied the obstacles to the Communists in recruiting memberships for their front organizations and maintaining discipline over fellow travelers in Government service. Few people will swear to an oath knowing it to be false and knowing that they might be liable to indictment and imprisonment for perjury. This requirement places a most difficult hurdle in front of the Communists attempting to ensnare an unsuspecting recruit into their conspiracy.)

In 1953, Dr. Albert Eason Monroe was listed as being chairman of the Federation for Repeal of the Levering Act (i.e., loyalty oaths), which was cited as being a Communist front organization by the California State Senate Committee on Education in its 1952 report to the State legislature.

5. Rev. A. A. Heist, executive director of the Southern California Chapter of the ACLU in 1952, and Dr. Monroe's predecessor. Rev. A. A. Heist was a signer of the statement to the President of the United States, defending the Communist Party (reference: Daily Worker Mar. 5, 1941). In 1952, the Reverend Heist resigned his position in the ACLU to become director of a new organization which he founded, called the Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms (CCPAF). This organization is run by its executive secretary, Mr. Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist. At a meeting of the district council of the southern California district of the Communist Party, United States of America, Dorothy Healey, well-known Communist and chairman of the district council, said, "The party preferred public protest meetings against the HCUA to be held by the Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms rather than under party auspices because Communists could attend without danger of being exposed as party members." (Reference: HCUA, H. Rept. 259, Apr. 3, 1959, "Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party"). The Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms was cited as being a Communist front organization by the HCUA on April 3, 1959.

The Reverend Heist stated in a speech to an audience of high school and junior college students in Pasadena that "the Constitution of the United States is outmoded, outdated, and impotent." (One of the stated goals of the ACLU is to preserve the Constitution.)

In 1948, the Reverend Heist protested the withdrawal of the use of their hall by Occidental College to an identified Communist poet, Langston Hughes, who was to speak on a poem of his entitled, "Goodbye, Christ," which called for "Christ, Jesus, Lord God Jehovah" to "beat it" and "make way

for a new guy named Marx, Communist Lenin, Peasant Stalin, and worker me." (Reference: Hollywood Citizen News, February 26, 1948.) This would not be a strange protest from an atheistic Communist, but when it comes from a Methodist minister?

6. Carey McWilliams, a member of the national committee of the ACLU in 1948, who now figures prominently in the affairs of the ACLU, has been identified in sworn testimony, according to Government documents, as a member of the Communist Party. Carey McWilliams has a record of over 50 Communist-front affiliations and citations. He is the editor of "Rights," the official publication of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee which has been cited as a Communist front by the HCUA (November 8, 1957).

7. Prof. William A. Kilpatrick, prominent member of the ACLU on the east coast, was for many years head of Teachers College, Columbia University. In his book, "The Teacher and Society," published in 1939, Professor Kilpatrick said that "the revolution by force and violence was probably necessary in Russia, but it would not be necessary in America. Here, the same goals could be achieved by effectuating change within the framework of the Constitution."

8. William Z. Foster, former head of the Communist Party, United States of America, was a former member of the National Committee of the ACLU.

9. Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, former member of the National Committee of the ACLU until 1940, is a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, United States of America.

In the report on "Communist Propaganda in America" (published 1935, A.P.L.) as submitted to the State Department, U.S. Government, by William Green, the late president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Green states that:

"During all the years since the establishment of the Soviet regime in Russia, propaganda in the United States has been conducted, not only through agencies directly set up by the Communist high command, but through agencies and organizations in which non-Communists of good standing and repute have been induced to participate. A careful study of these organizations show that they are so related through interlocking directorates that apparently some hundreds of organizations are dominated by an interlocking group of directors numbering not more than 60. Their tactics may perhaps be called the tactics of irritation, since their purpose is to create dissatisfaction as widely as possible and to bring into disrepute the authorities, and the established institutions of the country. As an example, the American Civil Liberties Union may be cited."

To support Mr. Green's statement of "the interlocking directorates," we discovered that when we looked at the record of the top 15 past and current leaders of the ACLU, we found that they had a combined record of over 1000 Communist front affiliations and citations.

SECTION II

What others think of the ACLU

1. Daily Worker, March 22, 1957. In reference to an ACLU meeting (New York chapter) featuring John Gates, editor of the Daily Worker, "It remains an axiom of our time, that to defend the rights of Communists is to defend the rights of all Americans." (We as a nation are forced to spend \$50 billion a year to defend ourselves from the Communists.)

2. California Senate Fact Finding Committee on un-American Activities, 1948 report, page 107: "The ACLU may be definitely classified as a Communist front or transmission belt organization." "At least 90 percent of its efforts are on behalf of Communists who come in conflict with the law."

3. House Committee To Investigate Communist Activities in the United States, report 2290 entitled, "Investigation of Communist Propaganda": "It is quite apparent that the main function of the ACLU is to protect the Communists in their advocacy of force and violence to overthrow the U.S. Government."

4. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, special commission to investigate Communist activities: "The ACLU, with its front of respectability and with its large membership of sincere, worthy citizens, has provided important legal talent and a camouflage of decency behind which Communist forces have agitated and promoted their campaigns."

SECTION III

Odd coincidences

1. The ACLU, long an advocate of unlimited freedom of the press and freedom of speech, asked Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson to withdraw a pamphlet entitled "How To Spot a Communist," prepared by the 1st Army and used by the Watertown, Mass., arsenal (New York Times, June 12, 1955).

2. The ACLU protested the publishing by the League of Decency of a list of movies and books that the league considered to be immoral. (Reference: Daily Worker, Mar. 22, 1957). (It has long been known that one of the primary aims of the Communist Party is to subvert the morals of the American public.)

3. The ACLU, when queried by Columnist Lawrence Fertig as to why "They did not defend the most basic of all civil liberties—the right of a man to earn his living without paying tribute to any other individual or private organization" (right of work laws in various States), replied, "There are no civil liberties grounds on which such statutes should be supported," (reference: Fortnights magazine, July 1955).

4. The ACLU has voiced the opinion many times that "they welcome investigation," but they unleash their vitriolic abuse upon the American Legion and brand the American Legion as a fascist group because they not only investigated the ACLU, but have requested the HCUA every year since 1953 to investigate the ACLU.

5. The ACLU has been the recipient of numerous grants from the Garland Foundation (American Fund for Public Service) which is the notorious bankroll for Communist front organizations. The Garland Fund is characterized by the California Senate Fact Finding Commission, 1948 report, page 247, as "the source of revenue for Communist causes is generally referred to as the Garland Fund."

The Garland Fund has also been cited by the United States House Special Committee on Un-American Activities as follows: "The Garland Fund was a major source for the financing of Communist Party enterprises," (reference: H. Rept. 1311, Mar. 9, 1944).

Among those who have served as directors of the Garland Fund and who were directly responsible for the disbursement of funds to the different Communist front organizations and who were or are now prominent members of the governing body of the ACLU are: Roger Baldwin, Harry F. Ward, William Z. Foster, Robert Morss Lovett, Morris L. Ernst, Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Oswald Garrison Villard, and E. M. Borchard.

6. Frank Wilkinson, an identified Communist and chief hatchet man for the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms in their "Operation Abolition" program, who, so far as we know, is not even a member of the ACLU, seems to be so prominent in the affairs of the ACLU. Also, an odd coincidence that a new organization that has been formed and which calls itself the National Committee to Abolish the House un-American Activities Committee (NCAHUAC) and has eight key

members in the organization that have been identified as members of the Communist Party gives its mailing address at 617 North Larchmont Boulevard, Los Angeles 4, Calif., which is also the mailing address of the Citizens' Committee to Preserve American Freedoms (CCPAF) and that of the 12 national committee members of the NCAHUAC, eight are currently officers or executive committee members of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (interlocking directorates?).

If any ACLU spokesman charges this report is biased, our answer is that it is biased only on the side of Americanism—that its only fault for those who don't like it is its bias in favor of truth and fact. In our months of investigation we were unable to find one occasion where the ACLU committed a patriotic act; we were unable to find one occasion where the ACLU has something good to say about America. We were able, however, to find many occasions where the ACLU and its leaders had something good to say about Soviet Russia or did something that would benefit Soviet Russia.

In our opinion, the ACLU and its brother organizations have mastered the technique of Josef Goebbels and practiced by the Moscow Communists to the nth degree. "Tell a lie, make it big, and tell it often enough so that soon everyone will believe it." They have been spouting forth the statement that "the rights of all Americans are being threatened" so long and so hard that already everyone is looking for the Gestapo FBI, the Fascist police, the minions of that inquisition, the HCUA, behind every bush and every telephone.

Deep down in the hearts of all good Americans we know that this is a lie and if we stop and think of its source, then we can look at it in its true light.

Nicolai Lenin said, "We must build communism with non-Communist hands." Please don't let it be your hands.

A Soviet dialectician's definition of a Communist front

George Dimitrov, "Advice to the Lenin School of Political Warfare," as quoted in the report of the American Bar Association Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 22, 1958, page 17719. "As Soviet power grows, there will be greater aversion to Communist Parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation or a retired general are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police. Every man has his value, his merit."

These Children Love To Read

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on September 18 in an insertion in the Appendix I called the attention of the House to the outstanding work being accomplished in the field of education by Miss Mae Carden, of Glen Rock, N.J. Today

I am including another article about Miss Carden which was published in the September 9 issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

As this article demonstrates, much of the work in remedial reading would not be necessary if pupils were taught properly in the first place. Miss Carden has, through Carden-trained teachers, in many of our schools, proven by actual experience the effectiveness of her teaching method.

Remedial reading can in large measure be just a palliative for a disease. It does not seek out the cause of the disease. It may be a cure, but it certainly is not a preventive. It is locking the barn door after the horse is stolen.

I believe we Members of Congress can give a tremendous boost to our educational system by advocating support of the Carden method of teaching reading. In pursuit of that objective, and under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Saturday Evening Post article:

THESE CHILDREN LOVE TO READ—IN SPITE OF PROGRESSIVE OPPOSITION MISS MAE CARDEN SUCCESSFULLY TEACHES CHILDREN TO READ BY USING THE PHONETIC SYSTEM—HAS THIS OLD-FASHIONED METHOD BEEN UNNECESSARILY MALIGNED?

(By Frances V. Rummell)

Miss Mae Carden, a benign lady wearing pince-nez and the air of a tea-table grande dame, bears little outward resemblance to a lifeguard. Yet she spends her days answering unusual calls of distress. These come from people floundering in a sea of misspelled or uncomprehended words. Most are school officials who are frank enough to admit that bumbling, hit-or-miss progressive reading methods have created havoc among their pupils.

Miss Carden, a formidable scholar fortified by inherited wealth, hustles to the rescue from her Glen Rock, N.J., home in a chauffeur-driven rattletrap. Her feats as an educational trouble shooter are prodigious. Within one grueling week, working a total of 15 hours after classes, she can show an entire elementary school staff how to aid faltering readers, and more important still, how to start beginners in reading correctly.

Before tackling the pupil problem directly, the Glen Rock educator must "unteach" teachers whose college training filled their minds with unworkable notions of how reading should be taught. Her stint done, she leaves her techniques behind, and they are permanent. Still, she likes to recheck occasionally—and when she reenters a classroom, both teachers and pupils have been known to stand and applaud.

But Miss Carden's achievements arouse no applause, or anything resembling it, from the closed ranks of orthodox or "party line" educators. Most top school officials, without bothering to make any on-the-spot checkups, dismiss the results of the Carden method as fantastic and the lady herself as a sort of Baroness Munchausen.

This Miss Carden realizes. With gentle understatement—she is so modest that she refers to herself in the third person—she told me: "Miss Carden's system of teaching is considered unorthodox. But her children do learn to read. The slow child may know delay, but he need never know defeat."

Incredibly, in this confused era when some children fail to master reading at all, Carden schools normally have no nonreaders. This staggers orthodox educators whose classroom tactics have created mass reading casualties among American children. When Dr. Malcolm Robertson, then superintendent of the Morris Township, N.J., schools, told a clinic

of such educators that his school pupils attained 100 percent readership during 10 years under the Carden system, they openly hooted in disbelief. Yet, as Doctor Robertson told me, "the records are open to anybody."

In another New Jersey public-school system, at Pequannock, the superintendent, Dr. Stephen Gerace, presents an even more surprising aspect. "One remarkable thing has been that we just don't have disciplinary problems any more," he says. "I assume this is because children no longer feel frustrated. Even the slow child can learn. Children with IQ's as low as 75 are able to read capably."

The reading pace in the Pequannock system, which has used the Carden method for 12 years, is such that most pupils are 2 to 3 years ahead of the national norm—a record that is about par where the Carden technique is used. Some parents have moved into the district largely to obtain this benefit for their children.

Miss Carden began her one-woman crusade to teach children to read 30 years ago in a bold revolt against progressive education. Her movement gradually spread through parent and teacher groups who rebelled against the progressive—and unproductive—reading technique, through administrators and teachers who took the Carden method into new posts, and by the superior performance of her pupils who moved into other schools.

Today the method is officially installed in 105 school systems. About 90 percent are public schools in New Jersey and New York, but others extend across the country into California. And nobody knows how many teachers use her techniques behind closed doors. In any case, all share one big headache: Coping with children transferred from other schools. Invariably they must be put back a year or two.

The massive extent of word jumbling in our average school has led the National Council of Teachers of English to term the situation chaotic and more serious each year. In city after city, surveys reveal, almost half of senior high school pupils cannot read or spell beyond fourth- or fifth-grade level. As many as 7 out of 10 young people entering college these days must be groomed in remedial reading or spelling—which is to say, taught sixth-grade work.

What, then, is the educational magic wrought by Miss Carden and a few other kindred spirits who have broken with accepted reading techniques?

Miss Carden and others like her employ the phonetic approach in teaching. They begin with the alphabet, teaching consonants, then vowels, and their sounds. As English is an alphabetical tongue, this seems sensible enough.

To the guiding lights of Teachers College at Columbia University, however, the phonetic or alphabetical approach is anathema. They virtually heaved it out some 30 years ago, as old-fashioned, in favor of the "look-say" school of teaching. This emphasizes learning whole words at a time, largely by appearance, with little attention to the alphabet and phonics.

Because Teachers College at Columbia pipes its ideas to most other teachers' colleges, professional educators throughout the Nation fell in line like so many drilling West Pointers. Phonetic teaching became almost extinct—except among a few hardy independents like Miss Carden.

The Carden method relies largely upon the technique which enabled most Americans past 40 to learn to read so effortlessly that they can't remember when they began. Although spruced up with linguistics the basic idea remains the same. From the age of two or three, youngsters of a past, luckier era used to learn "A for apple, B for boy, C for cat." They recognized individual letters and said their sounds.

"The alphabet," Miss Carden always tells her teachers, "is one of learning's great laborsaving devices. It takes the forbidding mystery out of reading."

Two criticisms most often leveled at the system are that it is "mechanical" and requires "practice"—words that are poison to many progressive educationists. Miss Carden replies with serenity: "Whether typing or using signal flags, our means of communication have been mechanical since the days of the tomtoms. And even they required practice."

Having mastered the sounds of letters and letter combinations, beginners under the Carden system hold the key for unlocking new words that they meet. As they read by turning letters into sounds, and spell by converting sounds into letters, they become as sure-footed as mountain goats on two pinnacles of learning—reading and spelling.

The big catch in applying the Carden method, especially in educationally ravaged schools, is that children should begin with it. Introduced too late, it can become as labored and mechanical as trying a new way to breathe. Approached early, the phonetic method becomes automatic, free and easy.

Miss Carden begins phonics with kindergartners. In one of the Carden-method schools, I watched a motherly kindergarten teacher and her pupils make a game of sounding consonants. Having a grand time, they went right on to sounding the vowels in the innards of words. Then, with confidence, they analyzed them on the blackboard and pronounced them—boat, lake, nose, eat, lie. Soon these tots achieved mastery over some 500 similar one-syllable words. Best of all, there was exhilaration in their faces as they recited. Young as they were, they knew they were learning something to last the rest of their lives.

The average beginner under the method learns to read, write and spell 2,000 new words during the first year alone—which, interestingly, is what first-graders in Russia learn. While recognizing that this initial skill-building is essential to the art of reading, Miss Carden's real enthusiasm lies in ensuring comprehension, or "the intellectual character of learning."

Steadfastly she declines to permit children to be distracted by pictures. The textbooks that she designed and published at her personal expense are without any illustrations at all. By present-day flound standards they look flat. This is deliberate. "Pictures," she says, "deprive children of the joy of exercising mental imagery. Make-believe is fun. It is also revealing."

First-graders, reading in their unadorned Carden primers, "I have a pall," love to describe the kind of pall they have. One speaks up, "Mine is little and pink and has a white puppy in it." So far, so good. There is always the child who boasts alarmingly, "Mine is heavy because it is full of snakes." And I heard one child volunteer, "I don't have any pall. My big brother stole it."

Such exercise of imagination tells astute teachers much about the youngsters' emotional makeup. Yet orthodox educators are flabbergasted to see that the method is "child centered." Actually, Carden-trained teachers share an abiding respect for their pupils' desire and ability to grapple with mental work, especially word meaning. Miss Carden invites children to look behind the word. One sixth-grader observed, "I'll bet orchestra is of Greek origin." I asked him why. "Because," he said, "the Greek 'ch' is pronounced 'k.'" Checking in the dictionary, he proved he was right, and went on to list other "ch" words like Christmas and orchid. "Now that," his teacher said, "is comprehension."

By contrast, teachers using the look-say or read-at-sight method show beginners whole words, usually with pictures, and expect them to memorize the word's appear-

ance from the picture association, context, or configuration. Thus monkey ends in a letter "whose tail hangs down." As the letters "C" and "O" always represent wheels, bicycle has two "wheels." Pupils who can't remember words from one time to the next are encouraged to guess. Thus, fish becomes "whale" or "guppy"; cat dwindles to "kitty."

Primers backstop this method by teaching words through repetition, and the child reading "Oh! Oh! Oh! Tap! Tap! Tap! Rain! Rain! Rain!" usually gets the idea that it's wet outside. So much repetition becomes numbing, to be sure. Even the most loyal educationists quip about the primary teacher who wrapped her car around a telephone pole and cried, "Oh! Oh! Oh! Look! Look! Look! Damn! Damn! Damn!"

As for the alphabet and its sound equipment, the look-sayers hold that "laboring with letters" is useless for beginners. Only after children have acquired a basic sight vocabulary do their teachers introduce phonics. Then they introduce them lightly and string them out for 5 or 6 years. Thus the teachers of look-say confidently assure you that they, too, teach phonics. They do—but about as adequately as a kick in the bathtub teaches swimming.

Whatever the look-say method's shortcomings, a good many children do learn to read and spell eventually. But a disgraceful number of bright children never surmount the strained efforts to turn English, an alphabetical tongue, into a language of pictures and configurations, like Chinese. There is too little for the reasoning child to grasp and analyze and too much to confuse him. As one critic sums up, "By the time you teach him three kinds of guesses—picture clues, configuration clues and context clues—what kind of reading do you expect?"

One answer, which stunned much of the teaching fraternity, emerged from an identical spelling test given recently to pupils of a suburban Denver school and to a Carden-taught school at Garwood, N.J. The Garwood students misspelled slightly more than 7 percent of the words. The suburban-Denver pupils, taught by progressive methods, mangled an awful 63 percent.

Such comparisons obviously do not endear Miss Carden to true believers in the progressive system or to her own professional alma mater—of all places, Teachers College of Columbia University. She took her master's degree there after being graduated from Vassar. Then, after 5 years in Europe perfecting her German, French, Italian, Latin and music, this Hawaiian-born daughter of wealthy American parents returned to Columbia to work on her doctorate in education.

At that point, about thirty years ago, Teachers College handed Mae Carden a rude shock. It discarded the alphabet as representing an outmoded "individual discipline." The then-new progressive teaching stressed learning through pupils' group activities and spontaneous interest—and whoever heard of a child born with a hankering to learn the alphabet?

Miss Carden argued politely with her professors. "You would create less havoc in education," she maintained, "if you just quietly junked the musical scale or multiplication tables. Fewer children would be affected." But the Teachers College faculty brushed her aside and spread the new mode nationwide.

Dropping her studies for a Columbia doctorate—"Suddenly it seemed to be without validity," she says—Miss Carden set up her own private day school in New York City. There she organized her phonics system and wrote teachers' manuals for her faculty. Then, like William McGuffey, the Victorian creator of McGuffey's Readers, she prepared readers for every elementary grade and published them at her own expense.

Public-school teachers also sought her guidance to lead them and their pupils from the maze created by progressive reading methods. By 1949 the demand reached the point where Miss Carden closed her school and wholesaled her instruction to entire elementary-school faculties, service free, manuals at cost. Later the teachers insisted upon paying her. She fixed a charge of \$15 per teacher for 15 hours, and a little more than a break-even rate on manuals.

In the widespread warring over reading instruction, those favoring Carden have been under fire persistently. Only a resolute minority of school administrators dares to approve the method openly. Most others icily reject all phonics teaching except for the watered-down minimum in the progressive system. The pattern of resistance scarcely varies from community to community. Regrettably it pits indignant parents against obstinate or evasive administrators, leaves classroom teachers humiliated and voiceless and keeps children confused and upset. Miss Carden rising above the din with patient philosophy, admits that each conflict sends her on a hat-buying spree. At least, she says, she is well-hatted.

The controversy in a small western city—let's call it Bartlett—is typical. It began when a survey showed that half of the city's high school students ranked no better than fifth-graders in reading levels. Ten percent, in fact, were down at third-grade level. Parents hit the ceiling. School officials evaded the issue. Many mothers invited Miss Carden to come and instruct them so they could teach their children reading at home.

Some 100 mothers of the community crowded into Mae Carden's course a year ago. To their amazement one lone maverick school official also appeared. An ambitious young reading supervisor, he was new to the Bartlett schools. That fact is now advanced locally to explain his tactical error in becoming a Carden enthusiast. He admitted to the mothers, "She's doing everything we say we do—and better." At his request, Miss Carden stayed on and instructed his primary teachers. The parents were jubilant.

Then without warning thunder rolled. The young supervisor reversed himself and signed a report to the Bartlett board of education terming the Carden method "rigid, authoritarian, and detrimental to children." With the board acquiescing, he directed his teachers to drop it.

The effect was to ignite community indignation. To combat this, school officials sent an S. O. S. to State teachers' colleges and rallied a battery of top reading experts. These calmly assured a mass meeting of 1,500 parents that "reading has never been better taught than it is today." More and more of the parents, taking the issue strongly, are teaching their children to read at home.

Bartlett teachers also have refused to abandon the Carden method. When I visited their city, they swore me to protective anonymity. Then they revealed that they used the method behind closed doors. Their own term is "bootleg." As one attractive bootlegger told me, "How can I help it? How can you throw away spectacles you've become dependent upon?" These teachers, whose names are withheld upon request, said their reading supervisor never visited their classes nor consulted them before making his bombshell recommendation to discard the Carden method. They and many parents suspect that his superiors advised him that his earlier enthusiasm for the Carden method was a grave error.

Yet many enlightened school administrators do recognize the importance and validity of the reading crusader's technique. Miss Carden says the greatest impetus behind the spread of her movement is their resolute good will. She also points with understandable pride to the fact that no top adminis-

trator who has introduced Carden into his schools ever has dropped it. In her third-person manner of speech she adds, "Miss Carden never set out to put over a method. School people came asking for it."

By now they are asking for it so widely that Miss Carden herself cannot keep up with the demand. She has been forced to parcel out most of the country to disciples while she concentrates on putting her method into more Eastern schools.

One thing that sent the number of calls soaring was a recent hard-hitting best seller, Terman and Walcutt's "Reading: Chaos and Cure," which termed the creator of the Carden method "a genius." Demands for her services poured in from virtually every State.

What is happening in California alone reveals both the extent of the reading emergency and the power of an idea. A veteran teacher of Carden is training private-school faculties in San Mateo and Saratoga and instructing classes of administrators, parents and teachers from San Francisco, Oakland, Richmond, Albany, El Cerrito, Santa Cruz, Sacramento, and Livermore. Last year Miss Carden personally helped Berkeley schools install her method on an experimental basis. Elsewhere, many teachers dissatisfied with look-say are bootlegging Carden.

A few other effective phonics methods are furthering the revival of basic reading. The elementary schools of Washington, D.C., in introducing phonics this fall, are going to use the Phonovisual method of the famed Primary Day School at Bethesda, Md. The Spalding Method of Unified Phonics has been used for years with great success by Catholic schools in Hawaii. Another system, called Hay-Wingo, has long been popular in Illinois. Seattle public schools are observing with interest a private school's achievements with the Beacon Series of Readers. And Los Angeles last year began borrowing from several methods. Fortunately teachers can learn any of the methods in 10 to 40 hours while on the job, and most phonics manuals and wall charts are very inexpensive.

All of this is highly helpful because of a factor that aggravates our reading crisis. Today's children are exposed to mass communications from the time they first hear a radio or toddle in front of a television set, and the gap between the many words they recognize from hearing and the few they can read and spell grows fantastically wide. Often they begin school at the age of 5 or 6 with an aural or recognition vocabulary of 8,000 to 10,000 words. Consequently Miss Carden is appalled that the current first-grade primers confine themselves to a sacrosanct list of only 335 words or so.

Flinging aside such artificial restraints, she believes in letting children learn and read as much as they wish. Her second graders go through perhaps 30 books a year, including ones approved by orthodox educators. At the year's end they possess workable 5,000- to 6,000-word vocabularies—meaning they can actually use these words in reading and spelling—plus, of course, the skills to acquire almost any new word they encounter. Pupils reaching eighth grade under the Carden method are expected to command 20,000-word vocabularies—an all-but-unique goal today.

What children read is as important to Miss Carden as how they read. "If all we have to offer children is repetitive, tasteless trivia, why bother to teach the skill?" she comments. To challenge children to stretch their minds, she introduces imperishable children's classics, beginning with Beatrix Potter's "Peter Rabbit" in the first grade. Older children read Tennyson, Mark Twain, Dickens, and Robert Louis Stevenson in the original versions. Librarians in Carden communities report that their young clients

more than triple their reading volume after Miss Carden calls at their school. What impresses the librarians most is the quality of the children's selections.

In writing, Carden pupils are as much ahead of the look-say, or progressive, products as in reading. Where many schools instruct in reading and writing separately, Carden schools teach them simultaneously. As their pupils read early, this means that they also write early. Even second-graders often dash off letter-perfect compositions. I tested this myself by proposing that students in a second grade write about a cat. Here, flawlessly spelled and aptly phrased, is one story:

"Nancy's cat is naughty and destructive. Monday he broke my mother's vase of flowers. Tuesday he cut Nancy badly. Wednesday he scratched a little girl. Thursday, as Nancy was walking home from school, he scared her. Friday he hopped up on a table and knocked over a little basket of apples. Saturday he messed up the house."

Later I dictated the same story to a university sophomore, the hapless product of look-say and college remedial English. He misspelled naughty (nauty), vase (vace), scared (scarred) and hopped (hoped). While his errors may not be earth-shaking, certainly my young university friend is not at ease with his mother tongue. From kindness I refrained from telling him that he spelled worse than a second-grader. But somewhere along his way through life the sad fact that he has been educationally betrayed will catch up with him. Then perhaps he'll wish he'd had a date with Miss Carden.

Negotiations With Outlaws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, negotiating with international outlaws and gangsters is the easiest road to war and destruction of our civilization. It is the quickest way to lose our remaining respect and prestige around the world.

The following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal, September 14:

SUING FOR PEACE

When President Kennedy met Premier Khrushchev in June, it could hardly be called a summit conference in the usual sense of a big power bargaining session. As both men have indicated, it was little more than an attempt to size each other up. From the U.S. viewpoint, the meeting could certainly be justified on that basis.

Now, though, there is increasing talk of, and increasing pressure for, a summit presumably designed to resolve such dangerous questions as Berlin and the nuclear arms race. The leftist-inclined neutralists Sukarno, of Indonesia, and Keita, of Mali, have just been appealing to Mr. Kennedy to undertake such a meeting. Already speculation is rife as to whether Britain's Macmillan and France's De Gaulle would be included in any such session. The U.S. Government at the moment seems disinclined to be stampeded into the thing, but it has been pressured before.

Surely all this is way off base. To see why, it is necessary only to recall briefly just what we are up against. Khrushchev is trying to push the Western Allies out of Berlin. He has resumed nuclear tests partly to apply terrorism to that end, and partly

out of what he considers his own military necessities. Negotiations are unlikely to deflect him from either course, for he has made it abundantly plain that he has no interest in real negotiations but only in extorting settlements on his terms.

Indeed, going through the motions of negotiation can serve Khrushchev's purposes, and is as intended; to the Soviets, "negotiation" is a means of waging the struggle, not of trying to end it. In the foreign ministers' conference on Berlin 2 years ago, the West finally did offer a series of concessions—not enough to satisfy Khrushchev, but enough to indicate the dangers of negotiations. And it is now clear how the latter stages of the test-ban talks were used to stall the West so that the Soviets could make their elaborate secret preparations for the current series of nuclear explosions.

Obviously, then, the United States should be wary of negotiations at any level, foreign ministers or summit or whatever. In addition, there is a further important consideration: This incessant talk in the West about negotiation, even about being the first to propose negotiation to the Kremlin, throws the whole picture out of kilter and tends to weaken the appearance of the allied position.

It is one thing to be prepared to listen to anything Khrushchev may want to say, in the improbable event he should have anything to say worth hearing, and we can certainly do that without a summit; in today's circumstances a summit is about the last kind of conference anyone should be thinking about. But what is needed more than communication is more iron in the Western spine, iron that shows in our whole attitude rather than just displays of increased military power.

We have seen again, in the scared-rabbit reaction of the Belgrade conference of neutralists, how much headway we are making with world opinion. We have seen, over too many dismal years, just how useful it is to negotiate with the Soviets.

Khrushchev, after all, is the criminal of the world, not the West. Khrushchev is the potential murderer of peace. Khrushchev and Khrushchev alone hangs the pall of nuclear war over the globe. If the barbarian wants to sue for peace at the bar of civilization, let him do so. It is not befitting the strength of the Western position, it is not befitting the dignity of the defenders of civilization, to appeal to the outlaw to be good.

The Bell Versus the Wall: A South Bend Tribune Editorial on Constitution Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an inspiring editorial from the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of September 16, 1961, entitled, "The Bell Versus the Wall," concerning Constitution Week which is being celebrated this week:

THE BELL VERSUS THE WALL

In Berlin, there's a wall.

In Philadelphia, there's an old, cracked bell.

Five weeks ago tomorrow in Berlin, Russian and East German troops began putting

up the barricades that sealed off one of the last escape hatches for the half of the globe where men live in slavery.

One hundred and seventy-four years ago tomorrow in Philadelphia, where the cracked bell is now enshrined, a group of determined men signed a document so enduring that it still is an unparalleled symbol of freedom for all men, including those men the Berlin barricades were built to contain.

The document was the U.S. Constitution. Under a congressional resolution adopted in 1956, tomorrow will be observed throughout the United States as Constitution Day, and the rest of the week as Constitution Week.

In this country, men and women with the image of Berlin's barbed wire still in their eyes and the echo of Russian nuclear bomb tests still in their ears can well afford to pause for a moment from the urgencies of the hour to remember that the piece of paper signed in Philadelphia is a stronger force than all the barbed wire and barricades that ever have been erected—or ever will be.

The Constitution and the Bill of Rights are our ultimate answer to the bellowings and rocket rattlings of totalitarian leaders. And they know it as well as we do.

If they didn't, there would be no barricades in Berlin.

Washington's Farm Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, this year, while the Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the Committee on Agriculture was holding hearings on H.R. 4510, the feed grains bill, I engaged the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman in colloquy. That colloquy was to the effect that the Secretary's proposals, contained in the bill, would not cure present surplus problems in feed grains, in effect, probably would cause others, notably in soy beans.

Later in the year, April 25, and after the emergency feed grains bill had been passed, I again engaged the Secretary in brief debate as part of a full committee hearing on the omnibus farm bill, H.R. 6400. In this debate, I warned the Secretary that his obtaining passage of the feed grains bill, and subsequent dumping of grain on the market to force compliance with it, could encourage hog production. So that next year the hog producers were going to come to Congress and say, "Mr. Secretary, we are in trouble. We want you to help us out in the hog business."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that at least in their major portions, my predictions are seemingly coming true. In evidence, I offer this editorial comment from the Wednesday, September 20, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

WASHINGTON'S FARM WONDERLAND

The wonders of the administration's new farm program are beginning to unfold. And to at least some farmers it undoubtedly does seem like a wonderful racket.

To wit: With mandatory acreage reductions for corn and other feed grains, Secretary Freeman figured this year's output at around 125 million tons, down from about

156 million tons last year. Since that would be less than demand, the Government could make up the difference from its bundle of surplus feed grains, estimated at 75 million tons, and thus finally make a dent in the mountainous excess.

Unfortunately for Mr. Freeman, good weather and farmer ingenuity are conspiring to boost yields perhaps as much as they would have been without the acreage cuts. Hence it looks as though the \$750 million he—that is, the taxpayer—is paying farmers to reduce acreage of corn and sorghum grains will be for nothing.

So far, it's a fairly familiar tale of nature and human nature outwitting the farm experts in Washington, but that's not all. With some groggy notion of further stabilizing prices, the Department is offering surplus corn at the market price, which has been around \$1.04 a bushel, while the price-prop payment is \$1.20 a bushel.

This means the farmer can put practically his whole corn crop into the Government bins at the higher price and buy Government surplus corn at the lower price. You can't hardly beat that.

Oh yes—a couple of other interesting little ramifications. The cheap corn for the farmer may well lead to a new glut in hog production with the possibility of a big slump in livestock prices.

And already the abundance of cheap feed is causing cows to turn out more milk—now about 5 percent more than the record output of a year ago. Since the public couldn't drink all that without floating away, more and more milk is going into butter and cheese which are going into (three guesses) the Government surpluses. Just from last April the Government bought 189 million pounds of butter, compared with 82 million pounds in the like previous period, and 63 million pounds of cheese, compared with only 165,000 pounds in the previous period.

So you can readily see how wonderful it is when our masters in Washington start stabilizing things and getting them all straightened out for us incompetent citizens.

Flynn Rates High Among Former Northeast Ring Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting article about Mr. Arthur Flynn, a resident of my home city of Lawrence, Mass., who was an outstanding boxer for a number of years:

FLYNN RATES HIGH AMONG FORMER NORTHEAST RING STARS

(By Peter J. Regan)

Arthur Flynn is a product of the old Shanty Pond district of South Lawrence. He grew up in a neighborhood where boxing gloves were part of every kid's standard equipment and where smokers with assorted types of boxing exhibitions were staged regularly in halls and church auditoriums and other gathering places where there was room enough to erect a ring.

As a kid at Lawrence High School, Arthur Flynn became an active amateur boxer. This was an era not long after World War I. The boxing craze was sweeping the Greater Lawrence community, what with the sensa-

tional comeback in the immediate past of that great Yankee Division favorite, Tommy "Kloby" Corcoran. Consequently, there were impromptu boxing bouts nightly in backyards, haylofts, and under street lights. Boxing gloves took top priority over baseball mitts in those days. Week in and week out the Buffalo Club amateur bouts played to capacity audiences of the Old Winter Garden on Essex Street and what with the abundance of gyms everywhere and numerous boxing clubs scattered throughout the State, much talent was developed.

Whereas today's professional boxer enters the ring with little or no previous experience, the boxer of the twenties was an experienced campaigner when he entered the pro ranks, very often having 100 or more bouts with capable opponents.

RECORD RARELY TOPPED

Flynn established a record in the amateur boxing circles that is rarely topped. While a high school student he won every amateur middleweight boxing championship on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, including the New England title twice and the national championship and the Pan American title in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Included in his long line of victories were wins over the Junior National, Canadian National (twice), Middle Atlantic States, New York golden gloves, and the National Intercollegiate champions.

Of the 91 amateur bouts Flynn participated in, he won 90. And while still a student at Lawrence High School and before turning professional, he acted as a sparring partner for Gene Tunney in Stroudsburg, Pa., while Tunney was training for his first bout with Jack Dempsey.

Flynn turned pro in the fall of 1926 under the management of William "Tee Hee" McDonough. He hadn't yet finished high school so he boxed in and around New England. In the spring of 1927 he left high school again to work as a sparring partner for Jack Delaney, who was training in Meredith Neck, N.H., for his bout in the Polo Grounds with Paolino Uzcundun. That summer Flynn received his high school diploma, then he traveled to New York with McDonough to set up camp in New York City.

Under the guidance of Billy Duffy, one of the top boxing figures in the country at that time, Arthur boxed almost on a weekly basis in the leading cities of the country. After a period he returned to Lawrence and on a straight, friendly business deal, McDonough sold his contract to Big Dan Carroll. For the next 4 or 5 years Flynn boxed as a professional around the New England States with occasional trips to Philadelphia, New Jersey, and other such spots.

In his professional career, Flynn took part in approximately 55 to 60 bouts and at different times held the New England middleweight and light-heavyweight titles. He boxed the top notchers in his divisions including such men as Dave Shade, Ace Hudkins, Tuffy Griffiths, Jack McVey, Lou Scozza, Nando Tassi, to mention a few.

They used to say that Flynn boxed every "gorilla" in his divisions, and Dave Egan the late sports columnist of the Boston Daily Record once wrote that Dan Carroll matched Flynn as though he were "mad" at him.

Nonetheless, Flynn wound up his career with a record near perfect. In his last appearance in North Adams against that murderous puncher of that era, Wild Willie Oster, of Chicago, Flynn scored a win. Oster was flat on his back in the 10th round, and the bell sounded at the count of seven, so it was recorded as a decision for Flynn.

BOUT SINGLED OUT

For many years the programs in the Boston Garden singled out Flynn's bout with a beller from Binghamton, N.Y., named Joe Zelinski, as the most sensational fight staged in the Garden.

During those days when Flynn and Andy Callahan would box in the Garden, trainloads of Greater Lawrence rooters would leave the old South Lawrence depot in masses to cheer on their local favorites. And the night of the Flynn-Zelinski bout, which was one-half of the double windup which saw Andy Callahan and Bruce Flowers in the other half, the Boston Garden almost had Lawrencians hanging from the rafters.

Jack Sharkey was at ringside, and Flynn had just returned from the Gus Wilson training camp with him where he had acted as a sparring partner for Sharkey when the latter was training for Tommy Loughran. Consequently, a warm friendship had developed between the two, and at the height of the excitement Sharkey almost leaped into the ring to root Flynn in during the heat of one of the toughest bouts ever staged. With the bout going nip and tuck for five rounds, Flynn finally kayoed Zelinski in the sixth.

Flynn attended Boston University for 3 years and Tufts College Medical School for 1 year. Lack of finances at that time compelled him to give up a potential medical career. While in college, Flynn became a professional wrestler in order to help pay his way, and over a long period of time he took part in more than 1,000 wrestling bouts.

Who Is Afraid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the September 10 issue of the Sunday New Ulm (Minn.) Review-Journal appears an editorial written by Walter K. Mickelsen commenting on Russia. Mr. Mickelsen points out very forcefully the fallacy of believing that Russia is ahead of the United States in agricultural production, industrial production or military preparedness. Most important, he states clearly and without apology exactly the course we Americans must follow in the trying times ahead.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHO IS AFRAID OF THE BIG BLACK BEAR?

Cartoonists have pictured Russia as the big bear which walks on its hind legs. Khrushchev has often been pictured with the claws and teeth of a big black bear. He doesn't object to this caricature because he realizes people generally are afraid of the big black bear.

Who in America is afraid of the big black bear?

Certainly not the American people. Every poll which has been taken shows that the American people are less fearful of Russia than are our Congressmen and Senators.

They are far more courageous than our national leaders as well as those who write books called "Profiles in Courage." Some of our leaders are saying they would rather "be Red than dead" as if they have such a choice.

The American people would rather be dead than Red and they have the courage to know they don't have to be either.

Americans generally know we cannot continue backing up and backing down. They are through fighting retreating operations as we have been doing in Yalta—in Korea—in Laos—in Africa—and in Berlin.

They have the courage to know that we have to stand up for the rights of all people or face the defeat of self-government all over the world.

The time has come when we just have to quit this business of first shaking our fist and then shaking our finger—and then surrendering the position of free people everywhere.

The time has come to make a stand—and God helping us—true lovers of freedom can do nothing else.

This brings us to the next question.

Just what have we to fear of the big black bear? He growls and threatens and blusters as puglies have done all down history.

Hitler tried it and succeeded—for a time—when he had infinitely more behind him than Khrushchev has ever had. He succeeded for a time and if Britain and France had called his bluff when he marched into Austria the world would have been spared a blood bath. We let him frighten everyone until it took most of the world to stop him in World War II.

What is there to Khrushchev's threat to frighten anyone?

Walk down the streets of Moscow or Leningrad or any Russian city and you get the impression of the way America must have looked back in 1950.

The people are poorly clad and wretchedly housed. Women have to do the heavy work because Russia lost 20 million people in 2 devastating wars.

When we look over the vast area of Russia we assume it is composed of productive agricultural land like our own country. Yet five-sixths of Russia is not agriculturally productive. It never has been and never will be.

One more important fact to remember is that almost all the settled areas of Russia lie north of the latitude running through Quebec. Moscow is as far north as the lower end of Hudson Bay in Canada and Leningrad has the same latitude as southern Alaska but without the warm Japanese ocean current. Less than one-sixth of Russian land is arable and forests cover one-third of that. There is no area in all of Russia which can compare with the Corn Belt in the United States.

Russia's basic, unsolvable problem is that almost nowhere is there combined in one place the three necessary ingredients of successful farming—fertile land, enough rain, enough warm weather.

Besides all this Russia's farm methods are primitive. It takes more than half of Russia's entire population to grow its foodstuffs. In the United States it takes only 6 percent of our population—leaving 94 percent free for other activity.

Yes, but what about industrial production? Again we are letting growth statistics brainwash us. Russia's industrial production is increasing at a rate of 10 percent a year while ours gains only 3 percent. It all depends upon the starting point. Ten percent of 10 is 1 percent while 3 percent of 100 may be 3 times as fast.

Steel, oil, hydroelectric power are the basic ingredients of industrial and war production. In all three Russia has just one-third of our production.

Machine tools and precision tools are vital in times of war. Russia is frightfully short of both.

Yes, but what about Russia's war machine and missiles? It is true that Russia has concentrated all their efforts on a huge war machine. She has concentrated upon missiles, rockets, and satellites. They have superior thrust to put machines in the air, but even when she knew our U-2 planes were flying over Russia for months, they could not do a thing to stop them.

No war—in spite of the fearmongers—is going to be won by nuclear blasts alone and Russia knows with our containing bombing

fields and Polaris-type ships we can deliver as good or better than we get.

Let's not be frightened by the Red empire either. In many ways the Red empire is more of a liability than an asset. It is made up of approximately 100 million captive peoples. Included are 17 million East Germans, 27 million Poles, 10 million Hungarians, 12 million Czechs, 16 million Rumanians, 7 million Bulgarians, and 6 million Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians who have fierce nationalisms of their own and are tied by history, culture, and religion closer to Western Europe than to Russia. Would Russia trust them with guns to march upon the West? Or would these people use these guns to shoot their puppet leaders and the Russians?

Also—what about Russia itself? Out of the 200 million people in Russia, 90 million are non-Russians. Twenty years ago millions of these people welcomed Hitler's soldiers as liberators and would have fought with Germany except for Hitler's stupidity and brutality toward them. It is quite apparent that Khrushchev has his hands full at home just controlling his people and his slave satellites.

Is Khrushchev planning for war? No. Not at this point. What he is trying to do is to frighten Americans and the people of the West with his threat of bombs and missiles.

He is trying to take the pot with a pair of deuces with nothing wild but Khrushchev.

No, our danger is not war and there is little danger of our being destroyed by war.

Our greatest danger is that we will be frightened by Russia's threats and alarmist talk and our fearful leaders will negotiate us into a false peace of compromise and defeat such as we have suffered from Yalta down through Korea, Laos and down to date.

America has but one honorable course to follow and that is to stand firm and quit backing up. If we do not stand for a principle we will have to stand for everything, everywhere.

We don't want war but we won't be bluffed into a dishonorable, false peace either.

Nearly a half century ago Theodore Roosevelt said it and it is true right down to today. Roosevelt said:

"Only those are fit to live who do not fear to die."

W. K. M.

Sousa's Marches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have been fearful that a trend would develop to discredit or ignore the great music of John Philip Sousa. The following editorial indicates and warns of a beginning. I hope it will not become general. John Philip Sousa and his music is just as American as the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the Fourth of July.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial is very timely and appeared in the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S.C., September 12:

IMAGINE BANDS NOT PLAYING ANY OF SOUSA

Attention, band directors in high schools and colleges from Maine to Miami, and from Hilton Head to Caesar's Head. Attention, youthful trumpet and sliphorn players,

glockenspiel tappers, bass drum boomers, clarinet tweeters and Sousaphone oompers.

South Illinois University's 120-piece marching band has announced that it will have no more "Sousa stuff" in its band exhibitions this coming school year.

Donald Canedy, director of the big Marching Salukis outfit, which has a full wardrobe of fancy uniforms, hats, equipments, as well as instruments, announced the other day:

"There will be no more John Philip Sousa stuff. We want strictly a big, open stage band. The entire ensemble effect will be more top, more middle and more bottom. It's going to knock people out."

Mr. Canedy evidently knows what he wants. His band will play for many special events, including a half-time show during the Chicago Bears professional game in the Windy City. He no doubt has his music lined up and the drum majorettes all geared up for fancy strutting.

But no more Sousa, no more "Stars and Stripes Forever," no more "Semper Parvulus," "King Cotton March," "The Thunderer," "Washington Post March" and all the other foot-tingling, heart-warming, wonderful marches that have set the world parading for scores of years.

How could Anderson's bands, or any others in this favored area, work up musical perspiration without bearing down on "Stars and Stripes" or another big number by the late great bandmaster?

No more Sousa? One might as well say no more Fourth of July, no more Santa Claus, no more Carolina-Clemson game.

Utopia Is Not in Sight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in honoring Constitution Week, September 17 to 23, the Enterprise Newspapers serving southeastern Los Angeles County have performed an excellent public service in editorially calling attention to the fact the U.S. Constitution still remains the hope and safeguard for Americans living on a troubled planet. The editorial, written by Mr. Ray Ross, is as follows:

UTOPIA IS NOT IN SIGHT

(By Ray Ross)

It is fitting and proper that this country pay tribute to the Constitution which gives us the basic rights and freedoms that set us apart from other nations of the world.

In spite of the fact that the Federal Constitution has been criticized as outmoded, and some claim that it has become passe in the development of modern ideology, no other nation has developed a document which gives more individual freedom and at the same time binds individuals together in the pursuit of happiness.

Yet there are those who say we should be relinquish our liberties and transfer our sovereignty to a world government under which all men would be free.

We admit that it would be a marvelous achievement for individuals of all nations of the world to have the individual freedoms we enjoy, but the time is not yet ripe for this to take place.

Surrendering our constitutional rights at this time would mean that Soviet Russia would have as much to say about our in-

dividual freedoms as would our own country, and at the same time, surrendering our freedoms would not grant individual liberties in the Soviet Union. By no form of idealized rationalization can there be a communism of freedoms. Tyranny and freedom will not mix.

Working toward world peace and freedom on a supranational basis, within the framework of our Constitution, is noble. But to surrender one iota of individual liberty would be a step backward, not forward.

The time may come when we can surrender our sovereignty to a world government, but that time will not arrive until all the major powers of the world have constitutions that equal or better our own constitution.

Such a utopia is not within sight. Until that utopia arrives, may Almighty God grant us the grace and may our U.S. Constitution grant us the rights, to retain the individual liberties we enjoy during Constitution Week, September 17 to 23, 1961.

New Judge Made His Mark in High Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, a most distinguished resident of my district, Judge Anthony T. Augelli, was this week confirmed by the U.S. Senate in his appointment as a member of the U.S. district court in New Jersey. The appointment by the President of the United States of this outstanding member of the New Jersey bar was in the best tradition of this high court.

He is not only an extremely able attorney of many years' experience, but he is a man who has the highest regard for the law and a deep understanding of human problems.

I respectfully request that an article which appeared in the Jersey Journal, a newspaper in my district, be included as part of my remarks:

NEW JUDGE MADE HIS MARK IN HIGH COURT

Anthony T. Augelli might be found at his office at any hour of the day or night preparing a case for a client.

"He just keeps going," said a coworker, "and he expects everyone around him to do the same."

Augelli has shown this devotion to his work since his admission to the bar.

He is expected to show the same dedication as a U.S. district judge for New Jersey. He was named to the post last week by President Kennedy.

Nominally a Democrat, Augelli has not been very active in politics. One associate says the only thing he's ever campaigned for was the St. Aloysius Academy building fund. The campaign was a success and the new academy in Jersey City is now in use. Augelli's youngest child, 14-year-old Patricia, is a student at the school.

Augelli's chief relaxation is golf. He sometimes takes a weekday afternoon off to play with his law partners and other friends. He is usually working on the weekends.

Augelli joined the law firm of former U.S. Senator John Milton in the early 1930's after his graduation from New Jersey Law School.

Five years later, Augelli became a partner in the firm, now Milton, Augelli & Kane, with offices at 40 Journal Square. Members of the firm argue cases in all Federal courts, and Augelli has been before the U.S. Supreme Court several times.

It was these appearances before the High Court, in part, that caused one Washington personality to say Augelli was of "Supreme Court caliber."

Augelli is a member of the Hudson County Park Commission. He belongs to several bar associations, the Jersey City Elks Club, and the Carteret Club.

A native of Italy, Augelli arrived in the United States at the age of 1 with his parents. He has lived in Jersey City since then.

He married the former Mary Carroll, of Jersey City. The family now lives at 104 Kensington Avenue.

Besides Patricia, the Augelli children are Kathleen, a North Bergen school teacher, and the twins, Robert and Marie. Robert is a Navy ensign serving aboard the aircraft carrier *Independence*. Marie begins nurse training this fall.

Prince Edward Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 17, the Prince Edward School Foundation dedicated the Prince Edward Academy. This represents a great milestone in the fight of the white people of Prince Edward County to preserve liberty, freedom, and constitutional government in America. They have been waging this fight over many years in spite of many obstacles and, oftentimes, almost alone. I commend them for their determination to preserve for themselves the right to choose their associates and to educate their children as they deem best. They have made a gallant fight and in my opinion, victory is theirs. They have been successful because they were willing to sacrifice, to work hard, and to follow in the footsteps of our Founding Fathers who were willing to sacrifice for the things they knew to be right and in which they believed.

I am fearful that the majority of the people of Virginia fail to realize the importance of the efforts that have been expended by the white people of Prince Edward County nor do they realize the opposition and obstacles that they have faced and finally overcome. I commend these people. I stand shoulder to shoulder with them.

I attended the exercises Sunday and heard the wonderful address of the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, of Richmond, Va., when he expounded high principles and concepts of constitutional government, individual freedom, and liberty. Mr. Andrews is a noble Virginian and an outstanding American. I commend him for the great work he is doing in trying to bring home to the American people the evils of socialistic government and the necessity of maintaining constitutional government in America if we

are to preserve our heritage as well as our liberties and freedoms.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the splendid address of the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, which he delivered at the dedication exercises of the Prince Edward Academy this past Sunday, September 17, 1961:

THE MEANING OF PRINCE EDWARD ACADEMY

(Address by T. Coleman Andrews)

This is a historic moment, marking, as it does, the dedication of a school that has been founded upon the solid rock of man's inalienable right to be the sole judge of the environment in which his children will be prepared to use wisely the privileges of freedom and discharge fully the responsibilities that those privileges inescapably impose.

This is a christening, so to speak, of a physical monument to a decade of uncompromising resistance of all efforts to take away that right of unflinching devotion to the conviction that life is not so dear nor peace so sweet, to the people of Prince Edward County, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery.

It is a real honor, therefore, to have been chosen to make the address of dedication on this inspiring occasion.

I say that this is a historic moment. This beautiful building, swelling so with promise, holds for me, as I know it must for you, many meanings:

It is the symbol of a significant victory over the evil of potential, if not actual, tyranny.

It is physical proof that a high sense of principle burns as strongly in you as it did in your forefathers.

It is, as it shall remain, a symbol of events that banded you together as you have not been banded for 100 years.

It is, in fact, a memorial to victory, and to a level of courage that all too often in recent years has been lacking in some who have had the greatest obligation to show it.

Look about you; see what the hands of love, of courage, of devotion have wrought. Look deeper; see what the hands and minds of dedicated teachers give promise of working. Look still deeper; see the spiritual thing you have done for yourselves, for your State, and for your Nation.

You gentle people of Prince Edward stood down the tyrant.

Here, in dedication, is the physical manifestation of your victory.

I say victory, for it is victory; what you sought is what you have: Your school for your children. And no living person, nor government, nor any Meddlesome Nettle of whatever sort, can tell you how to operate it. That is your victory. What was not, now is; you made it so. And I am grateful and proud that you have allowed me to share with you this moment of triumph.

I remember—as I'm sure you remember—that day it all began. Ten years ago your community was chosen to be the crucible in which the strength of our Nation was to be tested. Three years later, in 1954, the fire was stoked and the blow struck. It was a cruel blow, aimed at destroying your culture, at expurgating your mind, at uprooting your deepest convictions. You were struck a blow aimed, really, at changing you from what you had been into something you would not be.

During the ensuing years you fought back with single-minded purpose. There has been no time for reverie. Consequently, it would be surprising if the full significance of the attack has yet come home to you. A man in the trenches thinks only of the fight at hand.

If that be so, my presence here today should serve a constructive purpose. I should do my best, it seems to me, to com-

plete the picture—to lay bare the motives and the methods of those who struck you. I should try to help you to understand that what has happened here in Prince Edward—for all its critical significance for you—is but an element of a grand design. Those who would change your method of schooling your children would also change you totally. They also would change our Nation, totally. They are at work on a thousand fronts, not one.

Now, why was Prince Edward struck? Of all America, why was this quiet rural community singled out? Who did it? What was the motive for the attack?

Part of the answer is simple.

Prince Edward was deliberately chosen because of its superficial appearance. You are a peaceful people, with a patina of culture more than two centuries old. You are neither rich nor poor, nor any special thing except Virginians; you are as normally American as Indian summer, given to churchgoing, bill paying, good works, baby raising, and with something more than passing interest in the price of dark tobacco.

That is why Prince Edward was chosen. For a number of reasons, the prosecutors believed you could be had. They thought you were sleeping. So they tried to put their hand in your pocket.

That was their first mistake.

Had they asked me for an opinion, I would have warned against it. I would have reminded them that the quiet people of Prince Edward are the spiritual descendants of Patrick Henry. I would have told them that the twin marks of Patrick Henry's character—love of liberty and love of learning—are embedded in Prince Edward as deep as thought itself; that it was America's legendary Red Head, no other, who served as a founder of the first magnificent school—Hampden-Sydney—to grace your land.

After Henry, I would have said, came another, a gangling man with a strident voice and of certain convictions on the worth of liberty. His name was John Randolph.

No other community in America, I would have concluded—had I been asked—no other American community the size of tiny Prince Edward, has known two such founding fathers.

Did the transgressors forget? Did they forget your spiritual beginnings? Or did they, in their overweening arrogance, even know, or knowing, care? Did they really believe you are weaklings? Did they really think they could break your spirit? They must have. As I say, that was their first mistake.

In any event, this, your appearance of being malleable, is the reason your county was chosen, of all America, to be the crucible in which the character of our kind was to be tested. Conditions, from their point of view, were just right. So, they struck.

For America's sake, I say they could not have made a better choice—nor a greater mistake. For what they tested, they now know, was not a weakling but a Southside-Virginia Tartar, Lord love us, one of no mean metal. Now, 10 years after, your fight is won. There stands your school.

The second part of my thesis—Who struck Prince Edwards?—is more complex. Go back with me a bit in time. Nearly 30 years ago, there was turned loose in this country an evil so gross, so deeply dyed, as to exceed the understanding of the normal workaday man.

Its root in communism. But it was not communism, per se, that struck Prince Edwards. Rather, it was a two-headed relative of this worldwide conspiracy; and unless this conspiracy is understood—and being understood, routed out—it will devour us, all of us.

These twin evils—as communism itself—were born in Europe; and they have been injected into our lives with malice aforethought. I speak of the Freudian ethic and Fabian socialism. The first embodies the

philosophy, the other the method, of those who struck Prince Edward.

Let's look at these evils one at a time, but in reverse order. Fabian socialism has as its proclaimed end the precise design Karl Marx conceived for communism—destruction of the rights of the individual. Fabianism is not new; it was born in England more than 70 years ago. Its prophets were George Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells. In speaking of the ends sought by the Fabians, Shaw said they meant "to put an end of capitalism by developing the communistic side of our civilization until communism became the dominant principle in society." That is about as plain as anyone could put it, I'd say.

Those who oppose communism are accused of equating that evil with socialism. We do, indeed, for communism and socialism have a common objective—enslavement of man to the state. Isn't that what Shaw and Wells proclaimed?

The only material difference between Fabian socialism and Marxian socialism lies in their methods of operation. Whereas Marx would bring his ideas into being by every conceivable means—principally through violence and bloodletting—the Fabians chose stealth and the theory of gradualism as their modus operandi. Force, with them, is a last resort. They much prefer to skulk.

The Fabian plan of operation calls for infiltration of existing organizations. Once inside, and under the cover of anonymity, they seek, first, to rot, then to destroy. They are from the Trojan horse of communism.

Specifically, their plan is to change our land, inch by inch, little by little, without our appreciating the change—as the drip, drip, drip of water erodes away stone. Then, at long last, when they have brought America to the brink—when there is little difference between our way of life and textbook socialism—then, they hope, we won't consider the difference worth fighting for and we will just roll over and die.

Fabians remind me of nothing so much as a night prowler in a chicken roost. The thief quietly grabs the birds, one by one, tucks the head of each under its wing, and, without a peep from his victim, drops it in his bag—so quietly, in fact, that the hen on the next perch doesn't even know danger is present. Only occasionally does the sneak make the mistake of fingering some doughty, baleful-eyed, old rooster. When he does—forgive the expression—all hell breaks loose.

Today, after 30 years, the Fabians are in every coop we have, and their progress, inch by inch, has been phenomenal. They are in our political parties, they serve as justices of our courts, as voices from our pulpits; they are in our Congress, in our executive branch, in our educational media, in our schools, and in our newspapers and periodicals. In recent days, they have begun the muzzling and "take over" of our Armed Forces—historically the critical phase before the establishment of absolute dictatorship.

Even forest rangers now are forbidden to express patriotic disapproval of communism, lest they cause "alienation of groups or individuals." Alienation from whom, the Constitution-haters who are trying to deliver us into the hands of the Communists?

The Fabians are everywhere. Really. And our laws—those passed by Congress and those proclaimed by the courts—reflect their convictions. One by one, our liberties are being dropped into their bag.

Remember, these men are not necessarily card-carrying Communists. But I hasten to add that neither are they, by my definition, card-carrying Americans. Rather, they are tunnel-visioned people who mean to destroy through stealth the system of government so eloquently, so forcefully, so effectively established for us by the likes of Prince Edward's great men, Patrick Henry, and John Randolph.

Fabians deny their motives, as they deny their ends. Cynically, they proclaim their "Americanism" as they proclaim their allegiance to our flag and to the Republic for which it stands, all the while seeking to destroy our country and our spirituality.

The Fabian Socialists, then, are the people who are destroying the right of self-determination that the Constitution guarantees to you. They hold that the Constitution is outmoded and just so much paper. Their reason for being—their mission in life—is to whittle the Constitution away to nothingness. We must admit, I'm sorry to say, that their score up to now is an alarming one. Calculated subversion and stealthy attrition are powerful weapons against trusting and unsuspecting victims.

And who'll run things after all the common folk have been measured for their yoke of tyranny? Why, the Fabians, of course. They believe that government can manage your affairs better than you can—as long as they are the exclusive governing class. But perhaps there is some consolation for the rest of us in the fact that they apparently have forgotten what happened to Norway's Quisling.

I for one am sick of such people making me do things they say are good for me; and I mean to stand up—as you stood up—and say so. What's more, I shall do every legal thing that comes to hand to make them stop meddling in my private life. I shall fight for the rest of my days to thwart their schemes to deliver my children and grandchildren into bondage.

Are the Fabians sincere? Yes, they are. How, then, do they become convinced of the rightness of their cause, their night prowling? How can they justify attempting to destroy Prince Edward County? How can intelligent Americans justify selling out their Nation, bit by bit, changing the noble concepts we have known into something that approaches the amoral precepts of savages? How do they win so many converts to their cult without ever speaking the words, Fabian or Socialist?

The answer to that question has to do with the other head of their monster, something known to sociologists as the Freudian ethic.

The father of this deformed set was a medical man of sorts whose name was Sigmund Freud. He conceived his idea not long after the Fabians began to function. And because Freud's philosophy dovetails with the ends and methods of the Fabians, it was natural that Freud's followers should become Fabians, and vice versa. To repeat, one espouses the philosophy to justify socialism, while the other is full of the method of obtaining that end.

I shall not try to describe Freud's philosophy. It is enough for our purpose to understand its distilled meaning. Man, Freud contended, is born to a hostile world, against which, as an individual, he cannot successfully compete. Since man does not ask to be brought here, society, therefore, owes him the difference between his capabilities and his needs.

Think about that for a moment. Freud says, in effect, you and I are not capable of taking care of ourselves; therefore, somebody else must take care of us.

Who? Who is going to do it? You? Are you going to take care of me? How can you, if you are not competent to take care of yourself?

Freudians answer this question with an even fuzzier argument. They say that "society" should take care of the incompetents. And who is society? Why, everybody, of course. And who the incompetents? Well, by their own definition, everybody, since we all have been born to the same hostile world. So they would have incompetents taking care of incompetents, the blind leading the blind.

You think that reasoning insane? Does it sound like a fiat the mayor of Gotham might have issued? Whatever it sounds like, it is the reasoning behind the Freudian ethic.

It is, in like manner—if you have ever wondered—the motivating philosophy behind the do-gooder programs: the reasoning that has us labeling this section and that section of America as “depressed areas”; the reasoning that has us underwriting illegitimacy; the reasoning that has us paying foreigners to be our friends; the reasoning that justified to the Fabian mind the uprooting of so gentle a culture as that found here in Prince Edward County. These are some of the “thousand fronts” I spoke of earlier.

And do you know something? If we let them get away with it, if we let them go on telling us when to “gee” and when to “haw,” if we continue underwriting a world of immoral people—of cannibals and hottentots—then, I will be convinced, we will have become in fact the incompetents they take us for.

In any event, there are the forces that gave birth to the action taken against Prince Edward County. They would take from one whatever is needed—money, self-determination, freedom of association, anything—for the dubious benefit of another. And since we all are incompetent, they contend we have no right to object, but instead should be grateful to a guardian for making us do right.

All of which is based on the doctrine of force, the antithesis of the Christian ethic, which has charity as its keystone. Too bad some of our latter-day preachers don't understand the anti-Christ elements of their own Fabian-twisted minds.

Yes, they struck you. Why? Were you set upon because of your belief that separate-but-equal facilities is the proper—not the improper—way of living? Was that the real, the essential reason for the attack?

Hardly.

True enough, you do believe that separate-but-equal is the just way of life; you believe that separation is the only hope of compatible living among two races as different as night and day. What's more, to justify your conviction, you have three separate opinions of the Supreme Court that support it—opinions rendered when the Court was still guided by the Constitution.

Nor is Prince Edward the only American community that believes in and practices separation of the races. Our whole Nation, in varying degree, has been segregated since the beginning, and I make bold to suggest it will continue so.

What then is being attacked? Go back with me once more—for only a moment—to the ideology that now governs us.

Those presently in power are, remember, people who are dedicated to the proposition that you are incapable of governing yourself, wherefore you must leave your destiny in the hands of an elite such as they presume themselves to be. Therefore, our Government follows a pattern that has as its inevitable end the destruction of your right of personal decision in personal matters. As an incompetent, you cannot be expected to decide anything wisely, certainly not as wisely as “society.” That is what is being attacked: Your right of self-determination.

Now, our charter of liberty, the Bill of Rights that Patrick Henry insisted upon, has self-determination as its first premise; and the Constitution is based on this very thing, your right to make up your own mind.

To be more specific, the traditional, constitutional, American assertion is that man is free to choose, for himself, what church he will attend, with whom he will associate, what papers he will read and what work he will do, commensurate with his ability; or, conversely, whether he will do none of these, not work at all, but starve instead.

As should be patently evident, this concept, the traditional American, self-determination concept, is the opposite of the Freudian-Fabian-Socialist philosophy.

But philosophy without action is not enough; it never is to the remakers of the world. So, they fingered Prince Edward. But with the first touch of a feather that rooster thrust his spurs and the fight was joined.

They couldn't afford to let him go, and he just wouldn't soothe. So, they struck, hard, to kill his spirit. And true to their natures, their act wasn't even a good, clean blow; they fought like the cowards they are.

These footpads hid their motives behind an emotional camouflage. They had seen in this small community—or thought they had—a means to their end. They had hoped to move quietly. But once the fight was on, and since they could not afford to admit to the truth, they chose as their weapon an appeal to the emotions of ill-informed people. (What do Nebraskans know of Prince Edward?)

They accused you not of fighting for your right of self-determination but of misusing one race of people for the betterment of another. And with this unfounded charge as a garrote, they sought to wring the rooster's neck.

To paraphrase another man: Some rooster. Some neck.

They tried to take from you your right to determine for yourself how your children were to be educated, and you wouldn't let them.

And as long as the doors of this beautiful building stand wide, you will have completely thwarted the Fabians. This is your victory. You insisted on schooling for your children under conditions of your choosing, and that is what you have. I say that is victory.

One day the American people will come to realize that the Prince Edward incident had as much meaning for them as for you. Despite cruel distortions of the truth, our fellow Americans will come to realize that the battered few of this peace-loving land bore a banner that flared for all Americans. And, because of your brave stand, the liberty Patrick Henry cried for, the liberty Washington fought for, the liberty sons of America have died for in war after war did not perish from the earth. The fireball of liberty lit by the American Revolution did not spin into blackness.

Thus, as the school we dedicate today symbolizes your fight, so does Prince Edward's fight for independence of mind symbolize America.

Such is the fundamental meaning of those 10 years of strife, of toll, of trouble, that have culminated in this inspiring institution.

In a darkening world, you people of Prince Edward shouldered not only the burden of preserving your own liberty but the sacred principles of all America as well.

It has been a lonely fight. I know that. Such fights always are. But you are not alone. You never have been. Millions of God-fearing, patriotic, tradition-minded Americans throughout the land have watched and prayed that your strength would last. It did. Thank God, it did.

But let's have no napping. Though this particular citadel is built, and its forces are strong, the Fabians have not conceded. What has been all-consuming to you, has been to them but one facet of the whole. They will come again. It may be by another route or in another guise. But they'll continue the attack; you may depend upon it.

In the meantime, never forget that it has been these self-assumed supermen who themselves have proclaimed their purpose to be to deliver us all into Communist bondage.

The next onslaught against you will come again from the milieu of Fabian subversion and betrayal that has resulted naturally from that purpose. Is your will strong enough to resist that new onslaught? As I look in your faces—as surely as I know God is in His Heaven—I feel that it is. For the crucible has not seared you. It has but given you temper.

You must not fall. You will not. You will continue to stand your ground. For what is the alternative?

The answer, in a polite phrase, is a retreat from truth. The alternative is a compromise for something less than Americans have dreamed of ever since Patrick Henry sat with your forefathers and first lit the lamp of learning here in Prince Edward, there across the hill.

Patrick Henry gave birth to your tradition of learning as he gave voice to your love of liberty.

And though your eloquence may not match his, your convictions are the same. For they are your American birthright. And they must remain so, always. Despite hell and high courts, they must remain so.

Long live the spirit of Patrick Henry. Long live Prince Edward County. And may God bless you for your courage and devotion and continue to prosper your resistance to tyranny.

Foes of Reds Now Must Fight for Life— First of a Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 24, 1961

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Mowery is currently writing a series of articles on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. These articles are appearing in a number of newspapers throughout the country. Since the Committee on Un-American Activities is under constant attack from the Communists and extreme left-wing, it is my feeling that the Members of Congress should have the benefit of Edward Mowery's findings.

Mr. Speaker, first we should know something about the author of these articles.

Pulitzer Prizewinner Edward J. Mowery is no novice in the field of civil liberties. He has been described by Time as a specialist in the “Story Behind the News.”

In the midforties, his documented series on the false conviction of a Wall Street broker became a nationwide sensation, winning redress and vindication for the accused. In the fifties, the writer's articles concerning a man facing a third trial for murder are largely credited with achieving the defendant's acquittal.

And in 1953, after a 7-year fight to prove the innocence of another person serving a life term for murder, Mr. Mowery watched Louis Hoffner walk out of a courtroom—a free man. This crusade brought the writer the Pulitzer Prize and created a new category in the annual awards.

Mowery's exposé of the teenage drug menace led to scores of new laws in the Nation which tightened controls on the illicit narcotics traffic. His defense of the FBI against Communist harassment became a U.S. Senate document.

Among his 14 awards and citations, including honors from three universities, are the American Legion's Four Chaplains' Interfaith Gold Medal and the New York Criminal and Civil Courts Bar Association citation.

The article follows:

(By Edward J. Mowery)

(First of a series)

WASHINGTON.—Back in June 1930 Congress made a decision destined to subject a congressional body to unprecedented harassment, turbulence, obstruction, bitterness, and hostility.

The Bolshevik virus of mushrooming communism had spanned the oceans. Stalin was bidding for U.S. recognition of his motley "government."

And two other totalitarian diseases—nazism and fascism—were recruiting for the parade of subversive forces pledged to prosecute America.

Stalin got his recognition on November 16, 1933, conditional upon a solemn vow that Moscow would never interfere with U.S. internal affairs or plant his stooges on American soil.

Faced with a creeping Red menace in Government, labor, and scientific circles, Congress decided to establish the machinery for exhaustive investigation and exposure of subversion in the United States.

The vehicle: The Special Committee To Investigate Communist Activities, under the chairmanship of Representative Hamilton Fish, Republican, of New York. It functioned for 7 months.

Two other House committees with a more sweeping mandate to probe un-American activities followed under Democratic chairmen in 1934 and 1938. One received specific instructions to investigate Nazi propaganda.

The third special committee under the unbending direction of Representative Martin Dies, Democrat, of Texas, blasted its tempestuous inquiries into the full periphery of incipient treason. It made implacable and powerful enemies.

The sensational revelations of the Dies committee through the crucial years of World War II prompted the House to stay in the business of exposing subversion.

On January 3, 1945, the House established the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) as a standing nine-member body to safeguard and strengthen the Nation's internal security.

Through the years, HUAC has functioned as a colossal stage to spotlight anti-American activities, penetrate their objectives and evaluate their progress. It has recorded the testimony of 3,000-plus witnesses, disseminated 6½ million publications and crushed such organizations as Silver Shirt Legion, American Youth Congress, and the German-American Bund.

HUAC has seen 80 of its recommendations embodied in bills introduced and laws enacted by Congress. It has exposed espionage plots involving Alger Hiss, Nathan Silvermaster, and Harry Dexter White.

Members of the committee, regardless of the party in power, have never permitted partisan politics to interfere with their determination to preserve America's freedoms. But to certain elements, HUAC's field of investigation has been unpopular since the committee's inception. A wave of protests has steadily mounted through the years. HUAC has "meddled" in citizens' personal affairs . . . "smeared reputations."

In 1957, the smoldering resentment against the House committee blossomed in-

to an organized, well-financed "abolition campaign" to erase HUAC and vitiate or nullify the legislation it has helped to produce.

The campaign now raging—unprecedented in its intensity and bitterness—centers around a nucleus of 20 groups. It has gained support in student, labor, and "intellectual" circles.

It has sponsored countrywide speaking tours and rallies, engineered assaults on HUAC via newspaper ads, petitions, and radio "forums," and established picket lines at the scene of committee hearings . . . in anticipation of a riot.

One of the most vitriolic attacks on the committee was made on the floor of the House. (Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio Republican, termed the speech of Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat of California, "venomous and undermining.")

Torrents of inspired letters are pouring into Congress to abolish HUAC, and pro-HUAC meetings have been harassed by epithet-screaming pickets.

Who's behind the farflung abolition campaign?

The organized aspects of the drive, without doubt, is Communist-conceived, directed, and executed. Resolutions demanding elimination of HUAC were passed at the last two national conventions of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

The unorganized or sporadic aspects of the campaign—representing the "gray shadings" of political beliefs—include both non-Communist and extreme liberal factions in churches, education, and the sciences.

Leftwingers, however, are sprinkled throughout anti-HUAC organizations of all hues seeking the committee's destruction.

The campaign has also generated considerable support from Americans uninformed or misinformed concerning the House committee's mandate, origin, objectives, and modus operandi, despite the many TV spectacles originating in HUAC's hearing room.

Among the most militant groups in the abolition drive are:

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), a non-Communist organization of extreme liberals which has defended the constitutional rights of numerous accused subversives. In 1960, ACLU made abolition of HUAC its prime order of business.

The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (ECLC) and its west coast adjunct, the Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms. Both groups have been officially cited as Communist fronts.

The National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee (NCA-UAC). The single objective of this group, as announced last August in its initial flyer, is: "Abolish HUAC." Seven of the thirteen national officers listed in the announcement have been tagged as Communists before congressional committees, Subversive Activities Control Board, State Department, etc.

Affiliates and branches of abolition organizations are propagandizing against the House committee in scores of cities.

Why abolish HUAC?

Major charges against the committee pivot on its alleged abuse of the Bill of Rights, its handling of witnesses and illegality of its mandate.

HUAC, its opponents declare, violates first amendment rights by probing into political beliefs and associations, it pillories fifth amendment witnesses in the court of public opinion, discourages cultural contacts with certain countries and establishes guilt by association.

The committee also harasses, intimidates and tricks witnesses, misuses its authority, mauls the legal rights of citizens and conducts trial-by-publicity in a circus atmosphere.

HUAC's answers to the major charges:

The Supreme Court has twice upheld the legality of the committee's mandate (to investigate subversive activities) and the extent of its investigatory jurisdiction.

HUAC follows the "principles of procedure" and "standards of conduct" as recommended in 1945 by the world-famous Brookings Institution.

Any assertedly maligned witness before HUAC may request an appearance before the committee to clarify the record.

Committee spokesmen make no attempt to answer such charges as "witch hunting," "character assassination," and "thought control" which fall into what FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover terms the realm of Marxist semantic gyrations.

HUAC's millions of supporters include the major veterans' organizations, most of the press, leading churchmen, college heads, military officials and the vast, silent legion of Americans who neither demonstrate nor sign petitions.

(HUAC is currently receiving 2,000 letters each month, 85 percent of which is described as "favorable.")

HUAC's most significant support, however, comes from the House itself which has authorized its operating funds without a halt since the thirties. The House reconstituted the committee this year without a dissenting vote.

And Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, (Democrat, of Pennsylvania), the committee's chairman, was unanimously chosen chairman of the democratic caucus.

WALTER, an uncompromising foe of traitors and totalitarianism, said yesterday that HUAC will continue to pursue its undeviating course of exposing subversion in the best interests of all Americans.

"We in Congress," he declared, "have a sworn duty to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution. It is our desire to maintain democratic processes and preserve the freedoms established and guaranteed by the Constitution."

"This rests upon the more fundamental basis of preserving that form of government which makes possible the continued existence of the Constitution and the freedoms established by it."

The Communist movement, WALTER emphasized, is a criminal conspiracy dedicated to destruction of free society, and world domination.

"To achieve these objectives," he said, "it employs espionage, deceit, sabotage and terrorism. These aren't questions of beliefs, dissent, or unpopular views. These are criminal acts . . . no civilized or humane society can tolerate or endure."

"We would be delinquent in our sworn duties should we fail to meet the challenge presented by this criminal conspiracy."

"I don't object to anyone criticizing or attacking HUAC . . . as long as they stick to the truth. This committee is certainly as capable of error as any other committee of Congress."

"All of us can profit by criticism that is intelligent, sincere . . . and based upon truth."

What Can You Do for Your Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the newspapers in my district so often go beyond the mere re-

porting and commenting on the news of the day. They, on so many occasions, sponsor or participate in significant community and civic projects. By so doing, they become even more a motivating force for good citizenship.

During the past year the Jersey Journal, published in Jersey City, N.J., sponsored several important and very worthwhile activities. These have generally been in the field of education and included such things as Hudson County, N.J., first science fair in which schoolchildren of all grades participated. A countywide spelling bee has been sponsored by this paper for the last 6 years.

These projects are undertaken in an effort to "create a greater interest among youth in the written word, the history of our country, and the frontiers of science."

Particularly significant and timely was an essay contest sponsored this year by the Jersey Journal for high school students of Hudson County. So impressed were the editors of that newspaper with the inspiring message delivered by President Kennedy on the occasion of his inaugural that they proposed and sponsored this contest, with the purpose of keeping alive in the minds of the young citizens of that county and giving greater emphasis to the thoughts so splendidly expressed in that message. These endeavors to spark ever increasing interest in good citizenship, government and history, to assure a greater understanding by our students of the problems of the Nation and of the world and the role we must play as a nation and as citizens, are, in my opinion outstanding contributions above and beyond the primary responsibility of a newspaper in a community.

These programs designed to stimulate the thinking and encourage the students in the schools in Hudson County evidence the personal interest of the editor of the Jersey Journal, Mr. Eugene Farrell, in the youth of the communities which his paper serves.

I respectfully request that the text of the essay contest winner, Justin Camerlengo, be printed as part of my remarks as it appeared in the Jersey Journal newspaper:

"WHAT YOU CAN DO FOR YOUR COUNTRY"—PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY SPOTLIGHTS CHALLENGE

(Here is the \$1,000 prize-winning essay in the Jersey Journal's inaugural address essay contest.)

Written by Justin Camerlengo, of North Bergen, an 18-year-old senior at Holy Family High School in Union City, it is based on this quotation from President Kennedy's inaugural address: "And so my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

(By Justin Camerlengo)

THE CHALLENGE

Throughout American history the citizens of this Nation, it seems, have chosen the leader who best suited the needs of our Nation. Men such as Lincoln and Franklin Delano Roosevelt have been elected when their character and strength was essential to our very existence. With these men and their ideals came the words, the warnings, the soothing, the courageous statements that exemplified their administration of the heavily burdened office of the President of the United States.

During his second inaugural address, Lincoln, heartsick at the knowledge of American killing American, brother fighting brother, called on the country to unite again "with malice toward none, with charity for all . . ." words emerging from the blood bath of the Civil War . . . words remembered to this day as those of a truly great leader.

In the years that followed our country went through various phases of prosperity, depression, and war. In 1929, the greatest depression of all time was upon us. The years that followed put us to a great test, but the citizenry of this Nation responded by putting their hope in a man who could lead; the life of our country was placed in the hands of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

After his first term, upon completing measures to prime the pump and revitalize America, Franklin Roosevelt, seeing the horrendous clouds of war looming over the world, in an inaugural address told us "we have nothing to fear but fear itself." No matter what controversy has arisen about the man and his policy, there is no American who cannot agree that those words inspired us to give our all. These words soothed a troubled nation and encouraged us to work for victory.

On January 20, 1961, John F. Kennedy, after having mouthed the words of the presidential oath, went to the podium to speak. His awaited words came forth and, on that cold day, he challenged our country.

He did not plead as did Lincoln. Nor did he soothe and encourage as did Roosevelt. He shook us to our boots when he addressed each individual, saying, "Ask not what your country can give to you, but rather what can you give to your country."

This is a time of comparative peace. This is a time when we live better than the world at large. Why does he challenge us?

Let us examine ourselves. How do we live? A flick of a switch and our toast is done. A push on a button and we hear music and the latest news. The dialing of a phone number and we are served by electricians, lawyers, doctors and repairmen.

The country of wonders in which we live is a boom to society, and yet it can be a plague to our Nation. How honestly are those pushbutton wonders manufactured and retailed? What true values are there in our communications media? Who come to our door with what kind of services?

We must, in our examination, agree that the latest appliances, as recent scandals have disclosed, can be made and retailed under immoral conditions, that television and radio can be a source of decay and there are those repairmen and professionals who think nothing of charging exorbitant prices. We would like to close our eyes to these evils, but by doing so, we would indulge in the greatest evil of all, apathy.

This is what our President attacked. This is what we must beware of. Our forefathers died for the rights of free speech, free press, peaceable assembly and freedom of religion. But not one drop of blood was spilled so that we might sit back and shirk our responsibilities. In that phrase, President Kennedy cautioned us to awake, to know our obligations and to live up to them.

How did America listen? What did America hear? In the best-covered campaign to date we saw a Senator become President. We listened to him and accepted him. Now, however, we cannot afford to close our ears to him. For now he campaigns for the victory of a nation and its people, not of a party. If we heed his request, each in our own way, we can improve our prestige in the eyes of mankind and of God.

When the challenge was made, America was stirred. Questions came from coast to coast, from young and old alike.

"What can I do for my country?" was the cry. "Join the Peace Corps? Join the Army?"

No. We need only to live our lives, but not as the Romans of old, rather to the fullest, knowing and living up to our duties.

If the businessman is more man than business; if the busdriver is more cautious than aggravated in a crowded bus; the teacher is teaching more than math or English; he is giving to his country. For from these people the youth learn.

I am part of America's future, as is each individual youth. But my responsibility is the greatest. It is my duty to God and country to utilize what talents I have and educate myself morally, so that, in the future, no President will have to say be kind to your neighbor, for I shall be kind, fear not for the fear of war shall be gone, nor give, for I shall be giving.

Get Tough With Neutrals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was among the first to question the morality of neutralism in a struggle such as the current cold war which involves so many moral values. Just a few days ago former President Truman said:

They ought to take sides with the free world. They're free now because we made them free. The Russians didn't do that. All the satellites they took after World War II are slave states now. You name one that isn't.

On September 12, 1961, in a column in the Montgomery County Sentinel, David Scull discussed the same topic in a thoughtful and provocative article. In an era when foreign policy is the concern of every citizen it is imperative that it should be widely discussed and generally understood from every point of view. I append Mr. Scull's column for the benefit of Members of the House:

GET TOUGH WITH "NEUTRALS"

(By David Scull)

The Belgrade Conference of neutrals has demonstrated once and for all that the basic ingredient of a successful foreign policy must be force. Khrushchev kicked this so-called Court of World Opinion in the teeth by his resumption of nuclear testing and they took it with an apologetic smile and mumbled expressions of "regret." Uncle Sucker and the other "colonialists" came in for a roasting, however, mostly because we are so nice and it is well known that we would never risk antagonizing the uncommitted nations by taking offense. Gracious me, No.

Whether they know it or not, these pusillanimous little hypocrites need us a whole lot more than we need them in the atomic jungle in which we are all living. Their very ability to posture and talk about remaining neutral is dependent upon our holding the Communist bear at bay. If it were not for our nuclear arms, the despots in the Kremlin would have crushed these egotistical annoyances like mosquitoes long ago.

The only thing that gave the neutrals cause for pause at Belgrade was the realization that Khrushchev was really threatening to shoot Santa Claus with his 100-megaton hydrogen bomb. The fear of a hot war by the unaligned is not a fear for themselves for they almost all live in the southern hemi-

sphere. What they fear most is an end of the cold war, which has proved so profitable to them in financial aid from both sides. Capital is what the underdeveloped countries need most. Know-how is available in Western books, already translated, but machines and the raw material sinews of industrialization cost money. An end to the cold war should be end of the line for the gravy train. This unthinkable tragedy is what sent Nehru scurrying to Moscow and Sukarno quick, like a rabbit, to Washington.

The Belgrade masquerade was a pitiful performance but it was very revealing. The principal actors cried piteously about the right of self-determination of peoples and yet they ignored the barb wire curtain that has just been thrown around East Berliners, fleeing to freedom in the West. These costumed hams strutted and rallied against the British. They knew that the British have set countless millions on the path of independence and strangely they could not bring themselves to comment on the butchery of freedom fighters in Hungary. These phonies castigated De Gaulle, who is trying hard to give Algerians a government of their own, and piously closed their eyes to the disgusting slaughter of Tibetans by the Red Chinese. Those who took part in this burlesque of a "conference" were not men, they were mice. They stand convicted by their own words of being nothing more than rank opportunists of the weakest sort. Devoid of principle, and lacking even a modicum of courage, they have shown themselves to be less than shadows of their own public relations images. They have swept themselves into the dust bin of history and their opinions deserve no further consideration on our part.

Vigorous action by Western democracies to defend and extend freedom throughout the world need no longer be hampered by such little men. There can no longer be "neutrality" between good and evil. If they are not with us, they are against us, and should be treated accordingly. By means of the Voice of America and economic sanctions, we can go over their heads to the people they represent. These people need and deserve our help, but we on the other hand, must have the loyalty and cooperation of their leaders for we are bearing the brunt of the fight for their right to remain free.

Arch realist that he is, Premier Khrushchev has said, "There are no 'neutral' men." The success of his policies to date stems from the fact that every move he makes is from a position of power and is executed with a ruthless force guaranteed to insure execution. At every juncture, when faced with a "fait accompli," the unaligned "neutrals" have given consent by their silence. The only language they understand is force. This being the case, the time has come to take charge of our own destiny in this perilous world. We can no longer afford to do less than is necessary because of imagined effects on these spineless shadows from the uncommitted world. We must get tough with the "neutrals" and get on with the business of winning the cold war while we still have the strength.

"A Great American for 1961"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, the magazine *Dixie Business*, which is

published by Mr. Hubert Lee of Decatur, Ga., has selected as its "A Great American for 1961" Dr. R. Minton Wilson, M.D., of Richmond, Va. The announcement of Dr. Wilson's selection follows:

R. Manton Wilson, M.D., who spent 40 of his 81 years as a medical missionary working among the lepers of Korea, has been selected by the editors of *Dixie Business* as the "A Great American for 1961."

Dr. Wilson went to Korea as a medical missionary in 1908.

A native of Columbus, Ark., Dr. Wilson graduated at Arkansas College and received his M.D. at Washington University School of Medicine at St. Louis in 1905.

The young doctor had been in Korea about a year when, in 1909, Dr. Forsythe brought him a little outcast leper girl for consultation.

There was no room for the leper in the hospital. So an old tile kiln was used.

Thus was started the R. M. Wilson Leprosy Colony, officially named half a century later in 1958.

"In Korea," Dr. Wilson wrote, "a leper is a very sad outcast and, of all people most miserable; but after receiving Christ I feel they become the happiest people in the world, as seen in the colony. They make remarkable Bible students and it is a real joy to see the miracle that takes place in their lives."

"This home to the leper is like heaven on earth, and one big problem is to get them to go home, even though cured."

"Even though cured, the world fears the leper still, and many Koreans cover their faces with a cloth and refuse to look toward the leprosy colony." Dr. Wilson wrote under date of January 19, 1960, "My home and general hospital was 14 miles away, so it was necessary to train them to carry on their own work."

"A staff of 25 lepers carried on about 90 percent of the medical work, even to major surgery and laboratory work."

"It is a little democracy all to itself. I know Dr. Stanley Topple will enjoy the work for they are most appreciative patients. And now so many can be cured."

"I hope you know Dr. J. Fairman Preston, 401 Clairmont Avenue, Decatur, Ga. We worked together for many years."

Why Dr. R. M. Wilson was named in 1961 "A Great American," instead of Dr. Preston or Rev. E. T. Boyer, or Dr. Jim Boyce, medical missionary who works in Mexico with my own former pastor, Rev. John Wood, evangelist, or any one of a thousand who have heard the call and went out involves a great mountaintop experience.

When the 1960 selections were announced for the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living," Dr. Wilson was on the list.

Dr. Wilson didn't get the most votes in the 1960 poll but here are a few quotations:

Dr. James Ross McCain, president-emeritus of Agnes Scott College, who was named to the honor group in 1951 upon his retirement (one of his sons, Dr. Paul M. McCain, is president of Arkansas College, Batesville, Dr. Wilson's alma mater) wrote:

"Hearty congratulations on 30 years of publishing and of promoting Southern leadership. Your last issue of *Dixie Business* records some very interesting historical materials."

"I would choose your latest addition as my first choice. Dr. R. M. Wilson is not the best known man on the list, but he has been as self-sacrificing as anyone and probably his name is written as high in Heaven."

"He has done perhaps the most sacrificial work with as little remuneration as anybody. He is also getting old and may not have many years in which to be honored."

Dr. J. Davison Phillips, Decatur Presbyterian Church, whose session includes elders Craig Topple and Dr. McCain, wrote:

"Dr. Wilson has begun a work which has been the means of hope for those who have given up all hope. In Korea, lepers are considered outcasts and many starve because no one has any compassion for them. All the elements of greatness are in the vision of Dr. Wilson."

Dr. James A. Jones, president, who was one of the speakers when I gave the late David Owens the Man of the South for 1951 award at the Charlotte Country Club, now president Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., wrote:

"A man who has done what he has done for the sake of the health of sick people deserves every tribute than can be paid him."

When I wrote him of his selection as "A Great American," Dr. Wilson replied:

"I appreciate very much the honor. I am unworthy of all this and wonder just how it comes about."

"We must give the Good Lord the glory for it is only through His Name can real good be accomplished."

"I often wish I might have another try at the past for would like to have done a better job. I am so glad that Stanley is carrying on the good work."

"This old world is in a sad and dangerous state and it is time for God's people to be in constant prayer."

Indians Working With Plans for Major Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 5, 1961

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress recently enacted my bill, H.R. 5235, to authorize the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation to purchase the hot springs resort within their reservation's borders. As I indicated in sponsoring the bill, this proposal is a key part of the general plan of economic development on which the Warm Springs tribes have embarked. I believe that my colleagues will find of real interest the following article from the *Oregonian* on this program. I know that I speak for the Warm Springs Tribes in expressing gratitude to the Congress for its prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

WARM SPRINGS GEARED TO "HOT WATER" NOT OIL WELLS—INDIANS WORKING WITH PLANS FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By George Lindsay)

WARM SPRINGS.—The old ways are rapidly giving way to the new for 1,400 members of the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs on their reservation, a chunk some 40 miles square in central Oregon.

Here in this unincorporated town, the center of government and education for this Indian country, the tribal council in mid-August took over at a cost of \$165,000 the nearly 320-acre Kahneeta Hot Springs Resort.

Now the council is planning a program of modernization and development which may eventually cost \$1 million.

Only a few blocks away other events dramatically portray the new role of the Indian in molding his own destiny—a departure from an earlier concept of the red man as a ward of the government.

During the past week Indian and white boys and girls enrolled in Warm Springs

School, newly transferred from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Madras Public School system, district 509-C.

SCHOOL INTEGRATED

Now integrated, the school this fall is providing expanded educational opportunities for 300 children, nearly double the previous enrollment.

About 85 of the pupils live in the dormitories and eat at the cafeteria as in years past. The remainder are from the village of Warm Springs and the immediate vicinity, with transportation provided by school buses.

Heading a teaching staff of 11 is Principal Elton Gregory, who came this fall from 3 years at Madras Junior High School.

Integration includes not only students but faculty members.

Gregory's staff includes his wife, an attractive Hawaiian girl and fourth-grade teacher. Another of his teachers is Louise Jackson, mother of four little Jacksons and the wife of Vernon Jackson, whose role in the tribal council is a triple one—elected member, secretary, and treasurer.

Jackson recently returned to his administrative position on the council after 4 years in Eugene, where he earned a bachelor of business administration degree from University of Oregon.

TRANSITION SMOOTH

Mrs. Jackson, a former Oklahoman, is a member of that State's Choctaw Tribe. She holds the master of arts degree in music.

Of 12 members of the faculty, Mrs. Jackson is the only one with previous experience in the school. The teachers in the Government school which closed its doors for the last time early in the summer went to other Government schools to retain their Federal Civil Service status.

Despite the all-new staff, the transition to public school operation has gone smoothly, Gregory said.

Credit should go, he said, to Jewel Plumlee, retained as a coordinator to assist in conversion of the school to public operation. During the past 2 years she was on the staff of the school, first as assistant principal and last year as resident principal.

When the Federal agency gave up the Warm Springs school, it turned everything over "lock, stock, and barrel" to the Madras School District, including two buses. The district supplied two more buses, and set about renovating the plant, including installation of all-new fluorescent lighting in classrooms.

UNITED STATES PROVIDES FUNDS

A wing was added to the main building for more classrooms, and seven new teacherages for married teachers are under construction with completion scheduled in October. The district obtained financial assistance from the Federal Government for this program under Public Law 815 which provides money for school districts in areas which have no tax base, said Joe Grenier, realty officer for the Warm Springs agency.

Before her connection with the Warm Springs school, Coordinator Plumlee was a teacher in the Indian rural school at nearby Simnasho, now also a part of Madras District 509-C.

The coordinator's duties include supervisor of the dormitories at Warm Springs, together with the school cafeteria, still under control of the Federal Government, she said.

But why the sudden gain in enrollment? Additional courses of instruction, including Spanish and sixth grade band, drew some of the credit from Principal Gregory. Previously many Indian parents sent their children to school in Madras because of curriculum advantages, he said.

Approximately 50 white children are enrolled this fall. They are from families employed at the Agency, and by the Warm

Springs Lumber Co. Formerly all attended grade school in Madras.

Control of the Madras school district is vested in the board of education. A member of the board and former board chairman is Dan Macy, Warm Springs merchant.

Buses take high school students to Madras.

While all these changes are taking place in reservation schools, the 11-man tribal council in its modern wing constructed a year ago on the Agency administration building is firing up its own revolution.

And this governing body for the century-old reservation, created by the Treaty of 1855, is a unique board, with wide powers, said Secretary Jackson. "It's a legislative agency," he said, "but also exercises executive and judicial functions."

Heading this influential agency is a tough, shrewd cattleman, Charles Jackson, the father of the secretary.

Several years ago the elder Jackson retired from his position as chairman and allowed his term to expire. At the insistence of other members, he recently ran for another 3-year term and was promptly elected board chairman.

NEW IDEAS EYED

But the age of Jackson and some other members of the board, all of whom are elected by popular vote except three tribal chieftains who serve for life, is no indication of conservatism.

The council is conducting negotiations to bring electric lights and power to all parts of the 1,600-square mile reservation.

The council controls sale of timber resources, fishing in reservation streams, extending to the middle of the Deschutes, and governmental functions including its own law enforcement program and court.

Return of the Kahneeta Hot Springs to Indian ownership has triggered plans for intensive resort development, which Council Secretary Jackson intimated "might well run to a million dollars." However, he pointed out, extent of the program hinges on recommendations to be made by a special committee to the tribal council and, the council's action.

This board of councillors includes Alan Galbraith, superintendent of the Warm Springs Agency; Realty Officer Joe Grenier; and tribal council members Sam Wewa and Vernon Jackson.

Representative AL ULLMAN's Warm Springs Indian bill authorized purchase by the tribes of the few hundred acres of non-Indian land within the reservation.

FISHING MAY OPEN

Kahneeta originally was a part of the reservation but had been privately owned since early in the century.

The resort is on the Warm Springs River 10 miles north of the Warm Springs Agency. White fishermen have long cast greedy eyes on the tantalizing Warm Springs, which lies wholly within the reservation and is closed to fishing except by special permits, difficult to obtain.

"Opening of the river near Kahneeta to fly fishing for resort guests is under consideration," said Secretary Jackson.

Whether this is being seriously considered was not disclosed.

Improved access roads leading to Warm Springs Agency and also the Wapinita cut-off road, Oregon 216, are under construction with paving slated in 1962.

The hot springs gets so warm that cold water from the river is sometimes added at the pool. The water contains calcium magnesium, sodium, iron and chlorine.

Tentative plans call for year-around operation of the resort with such added facilities as a lodge and golf course, and an eventual staff up to about 25 persons—an ambitious program indicative of the changing status of the Indians.

Economic salvation of the tribes may spring not from oil wells, but from hot water.

Miss Grace Duhagon Commends the Selection of Alfonso J. Zirpoli as a Federal District Judge in San Francisco's Little City News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention and to the notice of our colleagues an article written by Miss Grace Duhagon in the Little City News which I feel accurately reflects the feelings of thousands of individuals concerning the recent Senate confirmation of Alfonso J. Zirpoli to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

Al Zirpoli was admitted to practice law in California in 1928. He has served as assistant district attorney of the city and county of San Francisco and has served as assistant U.S. attorney for the northern district of California. He has been a member of the board of directors of the Bar Association of San Francisco and of the San Francisco Legal Aid Society. His work in organizing and serving as chairman of the panel of the Bar Association of San Francisco for the representation of indigent defendants in the Federal courts has in particular earned him the respect of the California judiciary and bar.

With Al Zirpoli's background and experience in the law, with his keen legal mind combined with his respect and deep feeling for his fellow man, I believe I may make one of the safest predictions conceivable: Al Zirpoli will continue to serve his fellow man with great distinction.

The article follows:

Several weeks ago we reported Alfonso Zirpoli would be appointed to a Federal judgeship in spite of the rumors flying high to the contrary. It is now but a matter of time. The FBI has given an "all clear" report. The American Bar Association has given him its highest recommendation.

There are still a few steps to go before official confirmation, such as, recommendation from the Attorney General of the United States to the President. Finally, approval by the Senate.

The thought occurs to me, it must be a feeling of real accomplishment on Al's part to have traveled so far from the time he was a young and unknown attorney. It also occurs to me he has worked hard to have reached this point. Very often, when a person makes his mark in life many overlook the effort poured into achievement and success.

In the years I have known Al, to say the least, he is unusual. He has an air of finesse about him. At times he is outspoken. He has the courage of his convictions. He is not afraid to stand up and be counted even though he may stand alone.

Most of us are aware of this thing called party politics. Al is a Democrat. He has worked hard for his party. We might even

call him a dyed-in-the-wool Democrat. But this is one time a man has been nominated for a high post who has the qualities to meet the responsibilities and make the judgments which will be required of him.

If I know the Italian-American community, plans are already in the making to give him a testimonial. If I have my way about it Giselda Zirpoli will be presented with a brilliant star. It is not easy to be the wife of a man engaged to politics and the community as Al has been.

No Appeasement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 14, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am much impressed by the recent Worcester (Mass.) editorial, "The View From Belgrade," which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD.

It sets forth admirably the situation, dilemma, and paradox of the so-called uncommitted nations. I wish that some of its views and principles could be considered and adopted by our State Department, and for that reason I am venturing to forward it to appropriate officials of that foreign policy making agency for their consideration.

It is my thought that the divine aphorism, "If you are not with me, you are against me," is applicable to the position of the so-called uncommitted nations.

What is more, this Nation has rendered many of these nations substantial aid and assistance, and I think we have a right to expect that, if these nations are so willingly accepting our help and support, they should also be willing to align themselves with us in fortifying the free systems upon which they and the free world must rest their hopes for ordered liberty, if they desire it, and freedom from oppression in the future, if they prefer it to slavery.

It should be clear to all thinking peoples these days that further appeasement of the Communist bloc would merely invite disaster. In fact, we should not forget that appeasement has been largely responsible for our present predicament.

The wise, prudent deployment and use of our strength, a resolute purpose to defend our freedoms, and the sound judgments of experienced leaders in the Nation and the world, are needed more than ever to enable us to avoid terrible nuclear war and maintain the peace.

To allow uncommitted nations to dominate our policies, our thinking, and our action as this time would make a bad situation much worse because their counsel of appeasement, if it be that, could merely serve to embolden the Soviets in its campaign for world domination.

We have a right to expect something better and more constructive from these nations than mushy neutrality in the

greatest struggle mankind has ever faced, and gloomy predictions calculated to inspire terror.

It is for these reasons that this editorial is a splendid contribution to contemporary thinking and our efforts to fix American morale and purpose at the high level it must maintain if we are to cope successfully with the great problems of war, peace and freedom.

I include the editorial, as follows:

THE VIEW FROM BELGRADE

Gathered together in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, are leaders of 25 nations. These nations claim to be members of neither the Soviet bloc nor the Western alliance. They call themselves uncommitted or nonaligned. Some, such as India and Iraq, actually seem to be as uncommitted as they say they are. Others, like Cuba and Guinea, are far closer ideologically to Moscow than to Washington.

These uncommitted nations represent about one-third of the world's population. They make up roughly a fourth of the membership of the United Nations. Their deliberations are bound to have a profound impact in Africa, Asia, and South America.

During the first 4 days of the Belgrade Conference, it has become apparent that these uncommitted nations have two principal concerns in the area of international politics. They are opposed to colonialism, they desperately fear nuclear war.

Their stand against colonialism has been vigorous. France and Portugal, in particular, have been subjected to bitter attack. The Bizerte incident and the terror in Angola have been major topics for the delegates. Their attacks on colonialism have been voiced publicly and privately without restraint.

Just before the Belgrade Conference began, the Soviet Union announced that it would resume testing nuclear bombs. Two test weapons have been set off, and nuclear fallout now is drifting across Russia toward China and Japan.

In view of the vigor of the uncommitted nations' assault on colonialism, it seems logical that their leaders would be equally strong in denouncing the Soviets' unilateral resumption of nuclear testing. In private, some were. Tito, for example, reportedly described the Soviet action as brutal. But in public, Tito said he could understand the reasons for Russia's decision.

Other statements were almost as weak.

It is impossible to know whether the uncommitted nations are simply terrorized by the Soviet Union or whether they actually fail to understand that the Soviets' goal is greater power. In any case, their panacea for world tension is an appeal to the West to negotiate with Russia. Negotiations, of course, are desirable. But the record of negotiation since 1945 hardly can be a source of great expectations. To think that Russia will negotiate away her plan for expansion—Soviet colonialism—is naive.

The uncommitted nations concentrate on Angola and refuse to recognize the Russian seizure of eastern Poland. They fret about Bizerte and ignore the Russian tanks in Hungary in 1956. They demand freedom for African states and fail to ask for immediate free elections in all Germany. It is almost as if the leaders of the uncommitted nations have read no European history since 1945.

Developments at the Belgrade Conference suggest the size of the task confronting the United States in trying to make clear to the world the danger of Russian-Chinese communism. The danger seems clear to us. But many other nations either don't recognize the threat or seem to think it can be best met by appeasement. Changing these attitudes will require vigorous Western leadership.

Contracts to American Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 20, 1961

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have become increasingly alarmed by the apparent trend in the policy of the Defense Department to award contracts to American manufacturers who are low bidders by reason of their processing or acquiring in foreign, low-wage countries all the high-labor content share of the project under construction.

The Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., of York, Pa., wired me concerning such a recent incident and I immediately wrote to the President of the United States bringing this situation to his attention.

Mr. Speaker, if further information sustains the position of Allis-Chalmers—that this means a distinct loss in American employment—I shall request the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to hold public hearings some time in October. It is necessary that this matter be probed more deeply.

The wire and my letter follow:

YORK, PA., September 17, 1961.

Hon. JOHN DENT,

House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congressman GEORGE GOODLING has suggested that I bring to your attention, threat to employment in Pennsylvania involved in pending award of contract for 15 very large hydraulic turbines for U.S. Army Engineer John Day and lower monumental projects. Apparent low bidder while based in Pennsylvania proposes to supply major portion of equipment from Japan. We estimate components to be produced in Japan would represent loss of approximately 1,700,000 man-hours of employment for American labor in the factories of the turbine builder and the major material suppliers, principally steel-plate forging and casting producers, mostly located in distressed labor areas in Pennsylvania. Allis-Chalmers, second bidder, have proposed 100-percent domestic materials and manufacture. If you are interested we would be pleased to supply detailed information to you in Washington at your earliest convenience.

D. E. SMITH,

Vice President, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT KENNEDY: I am in receipt of a telegram from the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., of York, Pa., protesting the awarding of 15 very large hydraulic turbines for U.S. Army Engineer John Day and lower monumental projects. The protest is based on the application of the Buy American Act which would allow domestic companies, also from Pennsylvania, to use 50 percent of contract bid for foreign components or equipment.

Allis-Chalmers bid 100-percent American labor, material and equipment. Because of interpretation of Buy American Act, competitors can process or acquire in Japan all high labor content share of project thereby putting American labor and industry at disadvantage in competitive bids. The differ-